

# Appendix 1: Survey Results

# Appendix: 1 Survey of Individuals Interested in the Little Darby Creek Area

In Early July, 2002, the Service mailed a letter and survey to approximately 3,337 individuals who had expressed interest in the Little Darby Creek Area in some way during the refuge planning process. The survey was designed to gather information from those interested parties on their views of local conservation action. The questions were based largely upon four basic principles of Hans and Annemarie Bleiker.

The Bleikers have been teaching citizen participation and consent building since 1976 when they established the Institute for Participatory Management and Planning (see Appendix 3). Their research has examined why some projects, although they may be controversial, are implemented and why others are not. What approach did those successful implementors or “Implementation Geniuses” as the Bleikers call them use to bring diverse view points together and reach agreement on a course of action? Their approach is too involved to summarize here in a few sentences. However, there are four basic points that the Bleikers stress if there is to be successful resolution of an issue. Key individuals involved in an issue must believe the following four points for successful resolution of the issue:

1. There is a serious problem or opportunity that must be addressed.
2. The entity who is addressing the problem or opportunity is the right entity to address the problem or opportunity and in fact, given their position, responsibilities, or interests, it would be irresponsible for them not to address the problem or opportunity.
3. The approach that is used to address the problem or opportunity is reasonable, sensible, and responsible.
4. The responsible entity for addressing the problem or opportunity listens to all participants and cares about what they think and feel.

The survey form was based upon this philosophy. Questions 1 through 6 and number 8 relate to establishing that there are issues or opportunities to address and identifying what those issues or opportunities might be. Question 4 looks at specific threats or opportunities related to agriculture, the rural character of the area, and the natural resources in the Little Darby Creek watershed. Question 6 sought to identify the elements of an approach that citizens would consider fair and sensible. Questions 7 was intended to characterize how respondents would know that their input and concerns had been listened to and considered. Question 9 was to enable us to distinguish Madison and Union Counties respondents

from others. During the refuge planning process, residents of those two counties were especially interested in hearing what their own residents thought about issues.

There were a total of 156 surveys returned by August 6, 2002. Of those returned, 41 were from Madison or Union County residents and 115 were from elsewhere. The responses are organized below by the questions that they pertain to. The words are those of the respondents. No editing has been done except in the case of profanities. Occasionally the hand written comments were difficult to read and in those cases, the best effort was made to interpret them correctly. The information is provided as a reference to those who wish to pursue local conservation action. It does not purport to be a statistical sampling of opinions. Rather, it is a snap shot in time of thoughts from a variety of individuals who have an interest in the Little Darby Creek watershed.

## The Responses of Madison and Union County Residents:

Total Surveys returned: 41 (not all respondents answered all questions, some respondents provided multiple responses to one question).

### **1. Do you value the preservation of agriculture in the Little Darby Creek Watershed?**

39 yes

#### *Comments:*

- To a degree. As long as it is small family farms.
- Yes, I do. It's the third agricultural county in rank.
- Yes, as long as it is environmentally responsible.
- Agriculture should use good conservation methods, such as filter strips, to conserve the soil, etc.
- Not at the expense of endangering the Little Darby Creek Watershed by run-off from ag chemicals.
- Very much so. I do not want to see this area developed in any way. I don't want a dam put in this area to supply water for Columbus, to supply prime building lots for developers to buy, develop and sell.
- I think the agricultural preservation to this region is very important to the economy of this area.

### **2. Do you value the preservation of the rural character of the landscape in the Little Darby Creek Watershed?**

39 yes

#### *Comments:*

- It is key – it will buffer the natural areas along the creek.
- But I would rather share with the right for people to live in the area, than having a swamp, weeds, snakes, rats, etc.
- I am very disappointed to see housing developments grow along the Darby.
- Again, no development please. I further believe there is enough development in Ohio. Need to focus on infrastructure we already have. Clean it up and use what we have already consumed. Let's start true conservation.
- I think this should be preserved, but by the people who live in the area.

### **3. Do you value the preservation of natural resources in the Little Darby Creek Watershed?**

39 yes

#### *Comments:*

- It should not be left entirely in the lands of landowners.
- As long as it doesn't get out of hand.
- Townships and counties should be more restrictive about building houses close to the Darby.
- Throughout the U.S.A.
- Because it is some of the only varieties of plants and fish and other aquatic species.

### **4. Are there threats to the preservation of agriculture, the rural character, or the natural resources of the Little Darby Creek Watershed? If so, please describe what you see as threats.**

- 1) Greedy developers who are willing to destroy to make money; 2) farmers who sell their property to developers again to make money and move somewhere in Florida where probate is nonexistent and they can pass on their inheritance to whomever; 3) Above all are the laws regarding: ability to rezone through rigged zoning boards, the issue of development rights of farmers and developers, and issues regarding inheritance and probate laws! They need marked revision. 4) We need a building freeze until viable solutions can be found.
- Yes – special interest groups that know nothing about conservation attempting to dictate policy to landowners; absurd endangered species legislation.
- Government interference and creation of additional bureaucracy.
- Government interference. By that I mean by those who have no knowledge of the area, population, etc., and have a “political motive”. There is no greater pride than land preserved and handed down thru generations – farmers are not the threat.

- Yes: Urban and suburban sprawl from Columbus, Ohio. Housing developments, corporate farms.
- I think the people of the community that work, farm and live in this area should have the ruling and the say as to what is done to the Little Darby watershed, not by people and organizations that do not live in the area.
- Yes: 1) urbanization; 2) sale of road frontage; 3) hope of pot of income at end of rainbow of future.
- The principal threat is the property owners' "right" to sell/dispose of agricultural property for development, including housing, recreational, industrial and commercial enterprises.
- Yes – more houses, more people, low commodity prices pushing the need to sell house lots to pay for being able to continue farming, landowners seeing big dollars in house lots whether they farm or not.
- Housing developments; single-family homes on lots of 1-10 acres; commercial development.
- City of Columbus; developers with no long-term interest in the area.
- Big Brother (USFWS)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife; U.S. Government using tax money to buy property.
- Any time government gets involved, there is always threats, government always forgets this (we the people) always coming in the back door and ramming their will down our throats.
- Of course, however Madison County has a strong pro-agricultural zoning program that is closely administered by our very forward-looking and aggressive County Commissioners. I feel that they will do their utmost to preserve the agriculture, the rural character and the natural resources of the area.
- The government and environmentalists are threats to private individuals's rights. This land was founded on rights of the individuals and those rights have been threatened.
- It seems that the City of Columbus and certain other government entities would be very restrictive to the farmers along the Darby, while encouraging M/I Homes and others to build housing developments which increase soil erosion, etc., during construction and disrupt the wildlife, and in some cases adds sewage treatment effluent to the Darby.
- Megafarms runoff (threat to all three); unlimited housing development. We have already lost much in farmland and natural beauty of our state.
- Rural character is being threatened by urban sprawl. Natural resources are threatened by urban sprawl and bad farming practices.
- Yes – residential/commercial development. Farmers selling off their farms to

big money developers/corporations, etc.

- No.
- Urban Columbus; Metro Parks, Wearhouse Ind. Parks
- Yes – commercial development and pollution.
- Columbus; Hilliard; Dublin; developers. Why would a farmer sell his land (on retirement) for farm purposes when a developer will pay so much more.
- Urban sprawl is devastating all of rural Ohio. Greedy developers are destroying the very features which make rural Ohio a wonderful place to live.
- Yes, very concerned about the loss of agricultural land to developments, especially 5, 10 and 20-acre plots turned into 5, 10, 20-acre lawns maintained by commercial chemical herbicides/fertilizers.
- Yes, sale of farmland to developers will lead to a loss in rural character and the loss of natural resources.
- I see Big Government, tree huggers, Fish and Wildlife Refuge, People that don't understand agriculture and where the food comes from for all our daily needs. That would give animals more rights than humans. I believe in the way God created things and in the order He created them.
- Yes. "Farmers" selling road frontage for residential development as well as the division of large tracts into small.
- Sell of critical areas.
- Housing developments, urban sprawl.
- Yes – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- The general public is a threat to the watershed because 1) they don't acknowledge our property as "private property." Everyone thinks that coming out of Columbus allows them access to come and "play" on our property with no regard to anyone else! 2) There are too many "tree huggers" worrying about what they think we should do with "our" property! Let's go to their neighborhoods and tell them what to do with their houses and yards. 3) We will stay rural and agriculture as long as the city folk mind their own business.
- Absolutely. Development. No zoning in Monroe Township encourages invasive uses.
- High taxes; government takings; violations of property rights.
- Primarily housing developments along with roads and commercial development. Population pressure is the worst.
- Residential housing and businesses being built on rich soil. Too many pesticides being used.

- There was a threat!
- I believe there are opportunities to preserve agriculture, the rural character and natural resources within the Little Darby Watershed.
- I believe the greatest threat to agriculture and the rural character is the sale of agricultural land by farmers, retired farmers, and/or those who inherit farms. Money and not a conservation ethic is what drives the present and future use of this land, and very few farmers can pass up the money they receive from the sale of ag. land to housing development. Twenty years ago, western Franklin county was predominantly farmland and Hilliard was a small town. If you believe that the local community can and should take care of its natural resources, all you have to do is look at Hilliard, Dublin, Pickerington, New Albany, Delaware County, Marysville, etc. to see the fallacy in that belief.

**5. Whose responsibility is it to address these threats (be as specific as possible)?**

- Certainly the state needs to intervene. If not, then the Federal government needs to say enough “sprawl”. Conservation and preservation needs to be a priority. Water is a priority. Profit making can’t be the practice if we are to survive as a nation. We must protect natural resources. Preservation of wildlife, water and top soil are crucial to our survival. We need to be change from the oil/gasoline internal combustion engine to solar/electric or propane autos and trucks. Not in 10 years, now! How hot does it have to get before politicians (more worried about reelection and playing politics) catch on to their unpatriotic actions of destroying this country.
- Elected officials who are responsible to protect individual freedoms of landowners.
- Landowners.
- As someone who has lived in this area my entire life, I can see that there is no greater pride and responsibility than the farmer. The land is their livelihood – they are already responsible for assuring this can continue. Let them continue without interference.
- Landowners; communities in the watershed; local and state government; EPA; Fish & Wildlife Service; the individual.
- Again, it is the responsibility of the people who live, work and farm this area.
- 1) current landowners; 2) all government of proper oversight; 3) the voters at large.
- Since the preservation of natural resources benefits the common good, the responsibility to address the threat of agricultural land being sold/disposed of or converted to other than agricultural uses is that of the Federal government, the State government, the County Commissioners and Township Trustees. As is appropriate to these jurisdictional units funds should be set aside to purchase and serve in perpetuity lands so as to maintain the LDC Watershed. Local zoning should never be allowed to endanger the LDC

Watershed.

- The individuals who own land, government starting at the local level.
- Local government – but I don't think they will, so it should default to state or federal government.
- Locally elected representatives (mayors, trustees, state rep.)
- Farming landowners who are the local community!
- If there was any threats: local government, local residents, property owners.
- Local residents.
- It is the government's responsibility to uphold the Constitution. We should have the right to do with our land what we see fit. We have always had the land as our first priority. The protection of our rights as citizens is foremost!
- The local government which controls the zoning is probably the starting point – city, county or township. They should make regulations after having input from landowners, Soil Conservation Service local representatives, local cooperative Extension agent, county engineer, etc.
- Civic responsibility. Elected officials (i.e. county commissioners) need to assume outlook for the future. Governor and Legislature could be more active in concerns. Mike DeWine has been a good champion!
- State, local government. The citizens.
- Zoning commission – someone to regulate or restrict development.
- Farmers, landowners, township trustees, county Extension offices.
- Local government, guided and directed and assisted by non-profits.
- In reality, it is the individual property owner. One individual cannot get anywhere alone. We must have integrity which is no longer a part of our society.
- 1) Local citizens; 2) local governments; 3) county government; 4) state government; 5) federal government.
- The local community should bear the brunt of the responsibility with support from local, county, state and federal agencies.
- Preservation of natural resources is an action done for the common good. Such activities are the responsibility of the government. The local resident have much to gain financially by selling out to developers, and they cannot be relied upon to act in the best interests of future generations.
- Not Big Government. Not city people, but farmers, landowners, people who have and hold the investment of land. Farmers who want clean water, who



want to improve, and build in the future. I believe that 95 percent plus of the farmers and landowners are responsible people who want to leave this world in better shape than they came in.

- With recent political “anti-government attitude,” there just isn’t anyone or anything to address the threats.
- Land owners and county authorities.
- Local government (township trustees, county engineers).
- Local community and local government.
- Let the local residents and local government officials who know the area and have preserved it thus far take care of our watershed! We have done a pretty good job of it or you wouldn’t have been here. The Little Darby has a scenic river designation for a reason.
- Local, state and national government.
- The owner of the property combined with the government reading and obeying the Constitution, the highest law of the land. We need to eliminate the illegal federal departments that are not expressly authorized in Article 1 of Section 8.
- Unfortunately, the owners of the land always take care of themselves first (i.e. will sell to the highest bidder). Townships have no legal ability to withstand annexation by cities. So, the surrounding cities have to support the preservation too. The triumvirate of owner, township, city.
- The county needs to control building permits and should not allow mega farms in Madison County. The U.S. government needs to watch what pesticides are being used by farmers.
- Local: towns, townships, county (all residents)
- It is the responsibility of local landowners, farmers and residents, with the help of local government, to make preservation possible.
- I believe the state of Ohio, Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division would be better choice as owners and managers. If left to local farmers, within 20 years the whole area will join in with the urban sprawl of western Franklin County. The ODNR Wildlife Division already has proven across the state that they are qualified habitat managers. Funding, however, must come from the federal government. The Wildlife Division has proven that they can purchase large areas of land from willing sellers, and manage the land for a wide diversity of wildlife species. They also continue to include farming, grazing, and multiple public use into the area, including fishing, hunting, and birding. The USF&WS however can’t seem to purchase land & severely restricts public use of it.

## **6. What are elements of a fair and sensible approach to addressing these threats?**

- Let farmers sell their property to the state zoned as agricultural. If development is allowed because of existing laws, then require very high impact fees. Stop teaching children conservation if the state laws continue to rob them of their futures through permissions to developers to destroy. Teach children through examples – not what should be, but what is being done now. Show impact and consequences of actions taken by all parties. Developers, conservationists, farmers, city dwellers and country residents.
- 1) Allow landowners to care for their land themselves until a problem arises downstream; 2) Accept that non-landowners have no rights to dictate conservation practices on someone else's land; 3) landowners accept authority intervention if their negligence caused a problem downstream.
- Utilizing “government” agencies already in existence when desired by landowner; programs such as CREP, WHIP, WRP, RC&D, FPP, EQIP, CSP, or CRP. Check NRCS website for details.
- Listen to the landowners – don't go away from meetings with no intention of incorporating their input.
- Protection of farmland from development; fair reimbursement of landowners; recreational use of the area to generate income for its management.
- Study the immediate area adjoining the Little Darby watershed not by taking large tract of land (50,000) acres like the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service had proposed.
- A recognition and attitude that we live in God's creation and are responsible to conserve the treasure entrusted to our stewardship. Our land is a treasure for all generations.
- 1) Federal and state funds to purchase at fair compensation any and all land so as to preserve the LDC Watershed. 2)) Strict zoning regulations so as to prevent forever any endangerment to the LDC Watershed.
- Concern among the residents of a community to maintain, preserve, and improve to the best interests of all concerned.
- Pay landowners a fair market price and hold the lands for public use – guaranteeing continued ag/natural use.
- Land use planning – Master Plan. Landowner compensation for non-development of land.
- The local farm landowner have done very well and can continue to do so.
- There are no threats except the U.S. Fish and Wildlife. I'm positive you could find some artificial threat to justify your meddling.
- Government leave us alone and understand we pay your wages. Listen (I

know this is hard for you to do.) No means no.

- 1) Follow existing zoning rules; 2) have some flexibility to listen to different approaches; 3) Use existing Fed Aid programs such as Equip and CRP.
- There is not fair and sensible approach because you never chose to see our side you only wanted what you wanted and when that didn't happen you're now looking for another way in.
- What is done in Logan and Union counties should be similar to what is done in the Columbus area – do not be very restrictive in agricultural areas upstream, and very free of restrictions in Franklin County.
- Limit or bar further “development” of area via more megafarms or housing area. Civic pride of residents and other Ohio dwellers. Preservation of Little Darby area is tantamount to national conservation and pride.
- Listen to local residents, talk over any sensible suggestions from local people.
- 1) Education; 2) zoning.
- 1) XXXX the District; 2) allow sale of property only to family or pass on in will; 3) land may not be sold for development; 4) XXX to pay modest price when farmers sells. Value established by a commission. Representation by government and farmer in equal numbers and a third neutral party.
- If people want to live in an environment free of the problems intrinsic in rural living, they should live and build in pre-existing cities.
- 1) Identify the threats; 2) evaluating possible approaches to eliminating the threats; 3) seeking input from local community; 4) arriving at a mutually acceptable solution; 5) implementing and monitoring for compliance.
- The plan must focus on the needs of the entire area and those of future generations. Current property owners have a right to their land, but their rights do not override our obligation to future generations. Any plan should equally distribute both the gains and losses over the entire affected population.
- On a county, local level, community. And I believe this is what you see has happened.
- Buy development rights.
- There is none. Money will decide the issue eventually.
- “Controlled” growth.
- What's good for both the people and watershed. The refuge proposal was what was maybe good for wildlife at the expense of the local people and the community.
- Local control.

- Locally encouraged preservation efforts with conservation association if government involvement will not be tolerated.
- The role of state, local government should be to protect our rights, i.e. prosecuting polluters.
- Open meetings. Opportunities for volunteers to be involved in planning.
- Don't allow fast growth in an around small, rural towns and definitely don't allow big cities and their suburbs like Columbus area ruin the Little Darby Watershed. The federal government needs to do more long-term research on pesticides.
- Keep Big Government out of it. Let locals do it.
- Working with local government agriculture security areas is a sensible approach for preservation. Also, 100-year floodplains must be evaluated for future land use.
- It is not sensible to believe that the local community has the interest or desire to address the threat. Although most people do not want the "government" to "take over landowner rights," I see this as the only means to preserve any resources for the public good. Local farmers will protect the resources of the area, but only if the money they receive in exchange is more than what they will get from some other use of the area. Keep William Hegge, USFWS Biologist as far away from our natural resources as possible. He is a closet animal rights activist and liar.

**7. What would indicate to you that those developing a plan to deal with the threats you have identified above really have listened to your input and do care about what you say?**

- 1) Laws would change drastically. I wouldn't rely on grassroots politicians because they are biased with their own interests guiding their agendas. 2) They would present the truth and let the people decide directly. (Politicians are too often only playing the game to be elected again.)
- 1) When special interest groups or "hired mouths" are not given an audience above landowners. 2) When landowners are left alone when their stewardship of the land is acceptable.
- Reply to specific questions and concerns, and keep us informed.
- Why does there need to be "a plan"! The people involved (landowners) already know how to preserve their land. Confusion and dissension comes when strangers come in and tell them what they should be doing, when they are already more knowledgeable than those developing "a plan".
- There is a plan to protect the watershed from pollution and destructive development. There is a plan for recreational use. Farmland is protected from development.
- This indicates to me that somewhere along the line the government has

found out that this country was founded policy that says government of the people and for the people.

- I have not really tried to communicate with you or other farmers because my concept of problem is much bigger than Darby Creek in part or total watershed. Most all good agricultural land is a treasure and should not be developed and farmed with good conservation methods. It should be zoned agricultural and no new house unless 50 maybe 100 acres with it. Could replace or remodel existing houses. State and local government give farmers who sign perpetual easement a real estate tax break. Both inheritance tax and real estate tax. Annual real estate tax be capped at \$10 per acre period in exchange for no development and farmed under conservation plan. Violation of conservation plan strong penalty.
- Simply that such funds and procurement process is in place and that such strict zoning regulations are enacted and enforced – nothing less will assure me that my concern has been heard.
- Continued community involvement and activity to improve, preserve and protect what we now have.
- Prohibit future commercial or housing development.
- I would like to see results published in the local media. Perhaps as an interest story on a local TV station. Display results at public events, county fair, etc.
- Nothing! Trust Big Gov. land grab!
- If U.S. Fish and Wildlife went away or better ceased to exist as a government agency that gets a free paycheck from the taxpayers and does nothing but trample on property rights.
- When and only when government is totally out of the picture. State and Federal.
- The county commissioners are very approachable, and willing to listen. In my opinion they are the logical leaders in these efforts.
- Letting us alone to manage the Darby would be foremost. Local control not federal control.
- In Union County, I have faith in our Cooperative Extension Agent, Soil Conservation Service employees, our County Engineer and some others. If they have input into the plan and are satisfied, I will be also.
- Public meetings, written communication re. proceedings. (Media not always reliable.)
- Action! Cut out all development; keep the agricultural complexion of our area.
- Any action taken involving local farmers, local government officials with all input considered as a possible solution.

- Their responses.
- Talk to me and let me see it (my proposals) in the plan.
- The land should remain natural for our grandchildren.
- 1) Involving all parties impacted by the plan; 2) meetings to discuss impact of plan; 3) compromise where appropriate.
- The plan should ensure the preservation of natural resources for future generations.
- They are willing to listen and share their thoughts without pushing us aside and taking our livelihoods away.
- Various government agencies and individuals realize the main issue(s). But lack the support, both politically and monetarily, to address the problem.
- I have voted many times to keep our own area. County, but to no avail – trustees of Union County do not listen to the voters.
- The USFWS tried to destroy this community. The Service has left this watershed community in a mess, that the local and state government will have to clean up.
- When the U.S. Fish and Wildlife finally signs off completely from the Refuge, then we will know that they have listened and heard us.
- I know government listens as “it is us.”
- The elimination of the U.S. FWS and returning the role of conservation to the states and to the people.
- Open meetings; coverage in the press.
- I haven’t heard of any government recommendations, (local government) thus far. People I have spoken to believe that the federal government could take their homes and land away if the wildlife refuge was established. That’s why they opposed it.
- Again, I do not see threats but opportunities. I believe individuals working on the Darby watershed plan care about the watershed. I believe the Little Darby Watershed is a result of generations of landowners and farmers watchful eyes and that trend will continue.
- If the plan involves more than just farmland preservation, and if the plan includes permanent soil and water conservation measures and wildlife habitat. Shelling out public tax dollars for annual or short-term conservation measures won’t protect the Darby, it will only delay the day when farmers sell off to developers. Buying development rights without mandating permanent conservation measures will not conserve natural resources. It will only preserve farming and continuation of erosion.

**Table 1: Topics Important to Madison County and Union County Residents**

<u>30</u> Landowner rights	<u>22</u> Landowner incentives	<u>28</u> Preservation of the rural character or the area
<u>29</u> Preservation of farmland	<u>30</u> Preservation of the stream corridor	<u>29</u> Role of the individual landowner
<u>27</u> Role of County govt.	<u>19</u> Role of State govt.	<u>12</u> Role of Federal govt.
<u>15</u> Environmental education opportunities	<u>13</u> Partnership opportunities	<u>15</u> Development and its compatibility with preservation of agriculture and natural resources
<u>15</u> Hunting & fishing Opportunities		

**8. Please check any of the following areas that you believe should be addressed in any local conservation action initiative or that would enhance any such initiative:**

Please list any other issues/areas that need to be addressed in any local initiative:

- I live on the Little Darby. I expect to be part of metropolitan Columbus in my grandchildren's lifetime unless development is stopped.
- Main concerns of the individuals owning large tracts of land is not the preservation of farmland, no conservation, but how will they, the owners, capitalize on the land.
- Landowners' rights need to be clearer. A few big farmers should not put the fear of God in the minds of small farmers and rural residents.
- Zoning is needed and preservation of the stream corridor should be encouraged.
- The Service needs to admit its mistake for this community to get along with its life into the future.
- Public access to streams and surrounding land.
- Cohesive efforts – not one group against others. Conflict leads only to accomplishing nothing!
- People in general don't respect much to begin with and when it comes to landowner rights they respect nothing about them.
- Fed money being used to influence county and local leaders and property owners.
- There is so little undeveloped land left that we must save it for the future. In this case the needs of the whole outweigh the needs of the individual.
- Participation of majority of land owners, minimal government involvement.
- Authorities must accept that their involvement is not generally needed in order for individuals to care for their property.
- Preservation of land owners' rights.

- People need to remember that we enter this world with nothing and take nothing with us into the next life. We are care takers of part of God's creation while we are here on Earth and should try to leave that a little better than at the beginning of our stewardship.
- Big government should stay out of a lot of local programs and focus on things that are really important to people.
- Total impact on the area in questions. Pay impact fee up front. Water! We don't have enough fresh water to last at present rates of consumption. More building brings more people and higher consumption by people, businesses and manufacturing.
- The fundamental conflict between property "rights" and the common responsibility for the common good.
- I believe we all want clean drinking water and clean air to breathe.
- Preserving the Darby Creek requires preservation beyond it boundaries. Union County and Madison need complete preservation plans for the whole counties.

#### **9. Are you a resident of Madison or Union County?**

16 Madison County

13 Union County

11 who responded "yes" to the question "do you live in Madison or Union County?"

## **The Views of Interested Parties Living Outside of Madison and Union Counties**

### **1. Do you value the preservation of the rural character of the landscape in the Little Darby Creek Watershed?**

Non-Madison or Union County Residents =	115 Surveys
	102 Yes
	8 No
	5No Response

#### *Comments/Statements*

- Yes, but only if the environment is protected.
- I value the right of the people there to decide.
- Yes, through private ownership of land without government interference.



- Natural resources/wildlife first, then agriculture.
- Yes, as long as the owners desire to farm it.
- Of course, we need to be able to feed our own population.
- Yes, but it must be respectful of the watershed-larger buffers less fertilizer and pesticides.
- Yes, but greater acceptance of organic farming is needed.
- Yes, this is incredibly great land for farming. I just don't want herbicides/pesticides/wastes migrating into the LDC
- Yes, to the extent that it does not conflict with the ecosystem or the will of the citizenry of Ohio and the U.S. as a whole.
- Yes, by not extending water and sewer, by zoning and by keeping taxes reasonable for farmers.
- Yes, not as much as preservation of open space.
- Yes, there are too few people who understand agriculture, let alone where their food comes from. You could promote education in this area.
- Yes, but I would want a tree buffer within ½ mile of the creek.
- Only if it protects private property and the freedom in America. Leave the land owners alone! This is America!
- Only if environmentally responsible.
- As opposed to protecting the watershed, no! But, I would rather see farm fields over residential houses and strip malls. Stop sprawl!
- Yes. Food does not just somehow by magic appear on store shelves in the cities.
- Not particularly, but its better than commercial strips and suburban sprawl.
- Yes but, only such that runoff would not harm the surrounding ecosystem.
- The value of the soil there is high.
- Yes but, I wish farmers also valued that preservation, instead of just giving it sentimental lip service. There are very few farmers left who really value "agriculture" except as they are able to rape the land for profit for their own generation.
- I support whatever freedom and a market unencumbered by the federal government wants.
- I value a level of agriculture that is compatible with ecosystem health and allows restoration of historic ecosystems.

- Not an open-ended enough question!
- How about incentives for atrazine-free or even entirely organic farming? Don't threaten or antagonize those whose primary issue is private ownership of their land but don't accept romantic but sometimes misleading calls to "defend the family farm." (already virtually extinct.)

## **2. Do you value the preservation of the rural character of the landscape in the Little Darby Creek Watershed?**

Non-Madison or Union County Residents = 115 Surveys  
 109 Yes  
 1 No  
 5 No Response

### *Comments/Statements*

- Yes, it is increasingly rare to have rural landscape.
- Only if local residents want the area to be rural.
- Yes, through private ownership of land without government interference.
- It is the owner's call.
- Agriculture and its people are the rural character.
- Yes, but rural should not mean sewage in the creek.
- Yes, given that suburban sprawl seems to be the only option.
- Yes, shopping centers, offices, factories definitely do not belong on top notch farmland. Houses/condos as in "subdivisions" don't either. What an insane waste.
- Absolutely, to the extent that it does not conflict with the ecosystem or the will of the citizenry of Ohio and the U.S. as a whole.
- Yes, I believe Ohio's Farmland Preservation Act helps in this area.
- Yes, urban sprawl is the biggest threat to the Darby Creek watershed. If it can through subdivisions it would lose its character, beauty, and water quality.
- Obviously the people there have valued the area for years! They do not need outside advice or control now!
- Yes, I see the developers as adversaries and greedy folks selling off land regardless of impact.
- Yes, the home builders lobby has a strangle hold on sensible development in Ohio.
- I would prefer to see it like it is, than as a mass of tract homes spread out all

over the countryside. I do not live in Ohio, so it is not for me to make a decision affecting the lives, the rights, the property, the future of others who are the ones affected (and have a great deal at stake, a great deal to lose if taken advantage of by way of excessive power and zeal). However (nevertheless), all my experience(s) in life tell me it is not prudent to just do away with a large amount of good farmland to turn it back to "marshes". Marshes so as to make more federal empire, more federal jobs. I once was enthusiastic as a boy about national forests, parks, national monuments, but the expansion of these is now a pretext to destroy human rights, including the concept private in property; Rights that most of humanity throughout history have not had, and indeed were denied by this or that form of strong-armed government (the Crown; the Pharaoh; the State; the bureaucracies of Sumer; the Dictator; "the " Party; etc.. Believe it or not, such a form of government (or rather power using the name "government") has gained a strong foothold in the great nation (country) still calling itself America. Very sad to say. I speak from decades of firsthand up-close bad experience(s), at the hands of such "government", as victim. That is why I put in my "two bits worth" here. For Americas sake.

- I value the preservation of open space and natural areas. Modern farms don't contribute to "rural character".
- It would be nice to preserve rural character everywhere.
- Yes, to the people there new and to others who enjoy visiting the region.
- Yes, by the farmers.
- I fear for the eventual loss of all of it to greedy farmers, greedy farmer's heirs, and greedy developers.
- Only if it is the highest and best use as determined by things that can be measured i.e., money.
- Rural character should be augmented with restoration of natural ecosystems.
- Yes, tract housing is the biggest threat.

### **3. Do you value the preservation of natural resources in the Little Darby Creek Watershed?**

Non-Madison or Union County Residents =	115 Surveys
	105 Yes
	4 No
	6 No Response

#### *Comments/Statements*

- Yes, this is the most important aspect of preservation.
- Yes! Many species only survive in this area.
- I do not believe in rules that can't be determined by future events.

- I value private ownership of land.
- Sensible uses of natural resources make civilization possible. I believe in good conservation and methods of use, not preservation.
- Yes, as much as possible, compromising with the farming.
- Yes, need to maintain diversity of habitats for the existing diversity of plants and animals here.
- The farmers have created the good environment of the Darby and don't need "preservation" assistance.
- Yes, currently there is a wide variety of fish and wildlife in the Darby watershed, many of which are not usually seen here.
- I respect the individual property owners stewardship and care of the natural resources-period!
- Yes, can greed be overturned by love of this resource?
- Absolutely. The marketplace for private individuals rarely if ever places preservation of natural resources above greed.
- I prefer to see it like it is, instead of doing away with the farms/farmers. America cannot afford to take in more and more and more private land to make it "federal" land, when the country is thirty percent or more government land/government owned/government ruled already.
- Farming the land will do that.
- Yes, in connection with the extreme value of the Darby Creek ecosystem.
- Yes, leave it like it is.
- I value the preservation of freedom in the Little Darby Creek watershed.
- Natural resources should be highlighted by their uniqueness. For example, compare the quantity of farmland in the State of Ohio to the area of native prairie or wetlands or oak savanna. Is there anything unique about the human community of the proposed refuge area other than the relatively low density population. What are current subsidies per acre of farmland in the area?
- Yes with community participation in decision making thought!

**4. Are there threats to the preservation of agriculture, the rural character, or the natural resources of the Little Darby Creek Watershed? If so, please describe what you see as threats.**

- Encroachment of housing developments. We continue to lose more and more farm land and natural habitat areas to sprawling housing developments

which do little to preserve the natural character of the land and its resources.

- Agricultural development encroaches on the natural resources of the watershed through the run off of fertilizers, unprocessed manure etc. A corridor should be maintained along all rivers and their feeder streams and creeks to maintain and improve the natural resources.
- Too many houses being built, and too many farms being split into two or five acre mini farms for housing.
- The U.S. Fish and Wildlife proposed refuge threatens agriculture.
- Number one threat is big government like U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that is often anti-hunting/fishing/trapping. You increasingly give into the environmental extremists. Number two Environmental extremists groups and number three Senator Mike DeWine.
- Columbus is close, and if the land is not protected, it could (and probably will) become suburbs of Columbus with housing developments and all the problems (in the environment) associated with them.
- There have been proposals in the past to reduce the above mentioned.
- Any group, agency, or so-called "interest" holder having input. The decisions on the Darby is strictly the concern of area landowners. Any others involvement is at threat.
- Yes. Federal government is making a refuge.
- Urban development west from the Columbus area. You see it on US 42.
- I see the government land grab as the biggest threat to freedom yet.
- Watershed is threatened by agricultural run off. Lack of concern of watershed preservation by farmers. There is a school being built right along Brand Road that will most definitely affect the feeder to Little Darby.
- Obviously, unplanned urban sprawl.
- Major threat-real estate development and subdivisions. Additional threat-intensive agriculture and related pollution.
- Land development, obviously. Zoning laws (if they even exist) are not enough to protect the watershed, the agriculture industry, or the rural character.
- Agriculture itself is problematic to the protection of the natural resources in the aquatic and terrestrial habitat communities.
- Agriculture threatens natural resources.
- Housing development and large agribusiness.

- Illegal federal takings.
- I see the threat coming from land developers and big government.
- Government by unrealistic, subversive ways of preservationist environmental. Where in the Constitution does the federal government find the authority to proceed on environmental issues? General welfare does not allow the federal government to go outside its Constitutional duties.
- Urban sprawl. Farmers or heirs selling land to developers.
- Urban sprawl.
- I believe that the people who truly want to farm this area will be out of business in the next 20 years. Pressure from urbanization and pollution will force them to sell their farms.
- Encroaching development and the trend of replacing agricultural land with sprawling suburbs.
- Urban sprawl.
- Unregulated development and suburban sprawl from western Franklin County.
- Development which does not take its entire impact into consideration.
- Commercial development of malls, subdivisions, etc. are always a threat to wildlife and their habitat.
- Agriculture has a lot of chemicals that can harm a natural watershed. Preventing farmers from doing what they have done for centuries harms all of us.
- Yes development! We are attracted to beautiful unspoiled land, then we ruin it by building homes! We need to encourage agriculture and the rural character with financial incentives to the owners, so they won't be tempted to sell.
- Any bare piece of land is a target of developers who are allowed to build anything they want (it seems) without adequate roads, municipal services, or care for the environment. Big bucks do all the talking.
- Farmers fear of intrusive oversight and their sense that the Little Darby Watershed is their private property to use as they wish threatens a great national treasure. Their ability to drive the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service out of the process amply demonstrates that.
- Number one urban sprawl from unchecked development around metropolitan Columbus. Despite an effort by the current mayor toward inner-city renewal, there are powerful groups ever-expanding development into Union and Madison counties.
- Urban sprawl, water pollution, and habitat degradation.

- Developers who seem to have the urge to build on and blacktop every acre in sight. Big business house building corps.
- If someone sells to somebody whose property maintenance procedures apply toxic chemicals that behavior will contaminate everything around, downstream and downwind. One property sale can do this and then another such sale...more such sequella...and then another such sale...it all begins with just one sale.
- The biggest single threat is that of the relentless urban sprawl which has engulfed Central Ohio. Another is agricultural runoff, and another the shortsighted, development-at-any-cost mentality of some Central Ohio politicians. Finally, the insularity and hostility of Madison and Union County residents to preservation efforts, even those which preserve agriculture, is another great threat to the Darby watershed.
- The incessant demand of developers to secure land to "develop". I'm afraid over time farmers will yield to financial incentives to sell to developers and local political entities will yield to the promise of higher tax income.
- Urban sprawl over development.
- Housing development - fertilizers and pesticides from residential areas, sewage, paved over land so quicker runoff - road salt. Removal of trees as housing spreads and land gets reassessed at a higher tax level farmers are more likely to sell for more housing.
- Farming - excessive use of fertilizers and pesticides without green belt next to river.
- Need for municipal water supplies/reservoir.
- Sprawl! Especially the development of sewage treatment plants in the area. Water treatment/development, higher pollution density, more draining/paving, faster runoff, destruction of this scenic river.
- The threats seem to me to be naive politicians (read callous), greedy land-owners, and partisan media members.
- Unregulated urban/suburban sprawl.
- Lack of protection for rivers and streams from non-point pollution.
- Lack of a system that would provide lower tax rates for agricultural land and farms.
- In the past, there has been little effort to preserve anything. Farms are easily converted to housing developments.
- Development.
- Sprawl, zoning, enforcement of environmental regulations is lax! Education!

- Large urban areas such as Columbus are always looking for areas for their inhabitants to recreate in. Many people have little respect for private property rights and feel little sympathy for farmers. They think that no one could or should own so much land. Politicians and the media contribute to this socialist trend.
- Development pressure - residential/commercial as from any expanding urban area. Agricultural preservation is not the answer, as agriculture also adds strain to any natural community - undeveloped park is preferred.
- Sprawl from Columbus and Marysville as well as oversized agricultural operations with insufficient buffer strips. Housing developments with septic systems instead of sewers, and poorly maintained septic systems.
- I see a threat when the Federal government takes control. They have not done a very good job - look at the fires in Los Alamos and other western areas.
- Urban sprawl - farmers who wish to sell and are able to have better economic profit by selling to developers.
- Housing divisions, polluted runoff from farming.
- Threats are that U.S. Fish and Wildlife will come in, acquire the property, and destroy it. They aren't interested in the environment, only in building a land base to control.
- Housing development, increased traffic, roads being built.
- Housing, especially ill planned - government take over, often leads to resentment and acres sometimes poorly cared for and off limits to public.
- Urban sprawl, suburban sprawl and large factory farms replacing family farms.
- The city of Columbus is constantly expanding outward, and exclusive home sites in a beautiful area would be popular with some short-sighted people. This would be and has been in other areas an on-going problem. Manufacturing and factory farms such as Buckeye Egg would also be a huge problem, as it was in Licking County.
- Urban sprawl.
- Urban sprawl, development that can afford to pay higher prices for land acquisition.
- Private sewage and agricultural (not necessarily sewage) runoff. Development will also add to runoff of silt; deforestation along riverbank.
- Urban development, centralized animal feeding operations, high-input agriculture.
- Principally from industrial scale agriculture - industrial scale hog farms, dairies, and egg production with high risk waste problems.



- I do not live in the Little Darby Watershed but, experience and observation tell me the threat is that to my knowledge, not on of those who so vocally opposed the federal preservation program has a conservation easement on their property. Eventually, the land will be sold for development.
- Government threats of intervention, control then subsequent neglect as historically proven by government control in other areas. Read my lips: This is America!! Get out of the Little Darby!!!
- Unrestricted building of residential , commercial and industrial projects.
- Unrestricted building and expansion of roadways.
- Unrestricted creation and expansion of recreational areas, such as golf courses that provide little or no habitat for native animal populations.
- Unrestricted hunting and fishing that depletes native animal populations.
- Government direction that is at odds with personal ownership.
- Possible housing and commercial development.
- Development and agricultural practices, upstream watershed degradation.
- Real estate developers, factory farms, urbanization, selfish citizenry, politicians with conflicts of interest, e.g., Deborah Pryce.
- The urban sprawl and development of lands surrounding the city of Columbus that are in the watershed. The increase of that populations density will change the rural character of the watershed. The pesticides used by the farmers already run off into the Creek without being purified by land barriers adequately.
- Development, housing, manufacturing, business.
- Development pressures moving in from urban areas residential and commercial; also inappropriate farming practices resulting in major pollution and sedimentation problems.
- From what I have heard, if not seen, agricultural runoff into the Darbys is building silt, killing wildlife, marine habitat. Urban development must be reassessed in general, along this watershed in particular. Smart development to be adopted.
- The Little Darby Creek Watershed is threatened by individual and corporate greed that has little to no concern about protecting rare and unique natural resources that belong to all Ohioans. The mis-information (lies) put out by Citizens Against The Refuge Proposal (CARP) likely crossed the line into slander and liable.
- Urban sprawls and private ownership of the land. Our laws allow a private property owner to do as he/she pleases with his/her property. This is the law and should stay the law. The only way to save the land is to have it become

public owned and designated for protection.

- As with rural areas around the USA, encroaching residential and commercial development.
- All the landowners that fought so furiously to keep the wildlife refuge out and keep the land in the hands of the farmers, will all sell out to real estate developers when the time comes to fund their retirement.
- Residential and commercial development, agricultural runoff.
- Sprawl.
- If you would adapt my plan it would save mega bucks and years and appease the farmers. All you need is 40 or 50 feet on back side of the stream to catch the poison the farmers put on their crops. This would filter all of it out, still have room for picnicking, cycle paths and any other recreation. I have a farm and two other properties involved in the watershed. If you could send someone to talk to me, I will explain it better. I am almost 85 years old, crippled, 90 percent blind, deaf but, I have grandchildren that need clean water and air.
- Urban sprawl, agricultural pollution, and global warming.
- The biggest threat, as I see it, is development of the watershed. Little Darby Creek will be protected only insofar as its watershed is protected from increased imperviousness, rampant urbanization, and sprawling subdivisions.
- Development of agricultural land is a threat to agriculture, the rural character, and the natural resources of the watershed.
- Yes, the government trying to put new regulations on the farmers.
- Creeping sprawl, development, “hardening” of watershed, incremental increase in pollutants into water.
- Poor quality farm management, plowing fence to fence and to stream edges, fall plowings, pesticide and herbicide use.
- Generally negative attitudes of current residents and landowners to environmental protections.
- Factory farming.
- Antipathy in community and government actions.
- Suburban sprawl is the main threat.
- Pollution; habitat destruction; residential, commercial and industrial development.
- The only threat I can envision is the government coming in and trying to be the savior to the problem that doesn’t exist. The federal government already

owns 40 percent of the land in the U.S. Can't it keep its greedy hands off the rest and let the people own it as private land owners?

- Housing and construction.
- The main threats are hard to correct. Especially once established such as housing developments, apartments, malls and so-forth.
- Unfortunately I see two camps (rural character may apply to either camp). Agriculture verses nature preservation. Agriculture runoff threatens natural resources, endangered species, river ecosystem, however, farmers fear the devaluation of land and loss of freedom. In total, I believe the natural resources are most in jeopardy.
- Uncontrolled sprawl and annexation. Farmers failing to use best management practices.
- I think agriculture would be threatened by a proposed wildlife refuge. It makes absolutely no sense to me to destroy productive farmland. Farmland is being paved over and developed every day.
- Development of land by retailers and home builders. Unchecked use of herbicides and fertilizers. Irresponsibly use of water.
- "Development" is a threat throughout the state of Ohio. Pollution (whether from industry, agricultural runoff or factory farming) is also a threat.
- The only threats to environment are disregard to private property rights. Landowners should be allowed to police their own property without federal interference.
- Road building, fragmentation, non-point pollution, sprawl, and nitrification.
- Sale of land to developers and the resulting urban sprawl. Recent news articles have led me to believe that the county and local governments are actually encouraging developers to buy up land for subdivisions and malls!
- Growth.
- I think agriculture with its chemical and bio-engineering is a threat to itself and to all life. I wish there were a way to preserve wilderness and rural life using natural systems agriculture. Of course the rising value of real estate is the main problem and the greedy dominance of the human animal.
- Major threat is expansion by Columbus in areas of Darby feeder streams.
- Interference by governmental bureaucrats at the federal level.
- Greedy farmers who supposedly mistrust and fear the government except when they pick up their welfare checks and accept even bigger subsidies, price supports, etc. every year.
- Greedy heirs of farm land, they never cared about to begin with, who can't wait to unload the acreage to the highest bidder.

- Greedy business people, developers, and their greedy attorneys who also give great lip service to caring about the environment - if it helps them get their hands on the acreage and bleed off the highest possible profits from it.
- The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is the biggest threat to freedom that we have in this country. I recommend that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service be shut down in order to preserve freedom, individual choice and liberty. Bureau of Interior ignoring the U.S. Constitution.
- Urban sprawl: 400,000 people in 20 years, subdivisions, golf courses, and someone possibly wanting to make the next great suburb; Large confined animal feeding operations (CAFOs) they pollute and force small farmers out of business.
- Development of land around suburbs west of Columbus (i.e., Dublin, Hilliard, Plain City)
- Development, development, and development. Keep suburban sprawl at bay through conservation-oriented purchases or farmland trusts!
- Do the farming with an awareness of good ecology practices

**5. Whose Responsibility is it to address these threats (be as specific as possible)?**

- I believe it is a joint responsibility of landowners, state, local, and federal groups. Landowners cannot continue a selfish attitude of this is mine and I can do what I please with my land. Each piece of land and how it is maintained effects all surrounding land. Local, state, and federal groups can aide individual land owners by providing funds to maintain the land and by providing education and alternatives.
- Local township trustees.
- Landowners, farmers.
- Local groups and local citizens should address specific local threats. Past that it should be Ohio state groups such as ODNR or Ohio EPA. It is not a federal government issue. The closer to the people the government is the better the input, oversight, control and the less it will cost.
- I wish the proposal had not been withdrawn. I wish the refuge was still in the works. Now we must rely on the landowners, who certainly made a fuss about the refuge. I think that the area will eventually be lost as a unique ecosystem.
- Society? Congress.
- Landowners.
- Private Landowners.
- It should have been everyone's (residents, landowners, local state and federal government). U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Nature Conservancy and others did

their parts. But, the concerted propaganda onslaught won. A wide range of parties intent on destroying the idea of Little Darby National Wildlife Refuge won.

- USA, government.
- We the people.
- Ohio is too republican to care - the Federal Fish and Wildlife Service should be the leader.
- Local populations and state natural resources.
- Federal government, state government, local government - counties.
- State and federal government is best equipped to address.
- Landowners-they must execute agricultural BMP's. Local officials-enact zoning codes where there are none, deny building permits, etc. To control growth and allow conservation developments. Developers-be innovative with housing projects to protect existing natural resources. State agencies (EPA mostly)-educate the public that agriculture is not always a good thing, conduct and release water quality assessments. Federal agencies-target the watershed to use Farm Bill money for protection purposes.
- Greedy farmers and developers.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ohio Dept. of Natural Resources, Ohio EPA, community members, both local and regional, and Franklin County Metro Parks.
- The owners and aroused neighbors.
- The people in the area. If the government is interested in keeping the area in pristine condition, purchase development rights to maintain the farm land.
- State and local government.
- Environmental experts not connected to the government since landowners in that area do not trust the government agencies.
- Government at all levels.
- Those with the legal right and the dollars. This then falls to government and special interest groups like TNC.
- It is everyone's responsibility, from the local populace, to the state/federal government to concerned citizens.
- Local citizens and surrounding area communities.
- I believe it is governments responsibility because property owners interests don't extend beyond their property. I had hoped the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would have succeeded in establishing this as a wildlife refuge. I

appreciate the work of the USFWS in trying to do the right thing.

- All parties need to address the threats but governmental regulatory agencies need to steer the evaluation of the threats.
- The local people - landowners.
- Local and national governments plus the people who live in the area are responsible. The ability to do anything about the problem is often limited by those who are in power and control.
- If any changes are made in status quo, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service can compromise.
- First, the people in the watershed-backed up by local city and county government, the state and the federal government. This watershed is a resource for the area and the state of Ohio.
- The elected officials, county commissioners, who allow this destructive exploitation, individual farm owners who plan to reap big money selling to Michigan and moving to Florida and who care about a river anyway?
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ohio Department of Natural Resources, Nature Conservancy or other environmental organization.
- County Commissioners, local/regional/state governmental entities, non-governmental bodies, conservation and environmental groups, and watershed management consortiums. Not the Farm Bureau and not individuals benefitting from short-term growth.
- Local owners, local government, state government, federal government, NGO's e.g., TNC, Ohio.
- Citizens of the counties involved and their elected representatives. Departments of federal and state government who are paid to watch over land development and water and natural resources. Conservation minded citizens of the state. Educators in public schools.
- It is the responsibility of the Federal government, of Ohio's State government, and of local officials to address these concerns, as well as private groups such as the Nature Conservancy and Sierra Club, and the citizenry as a whole.
- Administrators of effective land use legislation.
- Landowners, state of Ohio, natural resource department, township trustees.
- County and township officials through zoning. City of Columbus by not extending services and by not considering using Darby as water storage and putting a dam on it to create a reservoir. Park Service by continuing to buy lands as they are available along the river. Federal government purchasing

easements to create green belt and stream access for boaters.

- City planners-whoever allows/enables changes in zoning restrictions. Developers-storm water diversion would help NGO's, Feds/State purchase sensitive land (or offer easements). Landowners-minimize agriculture runoff/pollutants. Citizens-be behind proactive measures.
- The congress of the U.S., state legislature, county and local wards.
- The state should establish agricultural and conservation taxing districts for sensitive environmental areas. The state should regulate non-point pollution. The Fish and Wildlife Service should reinvigorate its refuge plan with the assistance of the Nature Conservancy.
- Currently it is the local zoning boards and township trustees or county commissioners depending upon the type of zoning, if any, in force.
- All citizens, U.S. government, state government, farmers.
- Local government, land owners, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Not U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- City planners who need to look at urban land use and planning.
- Local landowners, conservation organizations such as The Nature Conservancy, local and state legislative authority.
- Mid-Ohio Regional Planning Commission, Union, Franklin and Madison County Commissioners, City of Columbus, Hilliard, Dublin, Grove City, individual residents of the watershed, developers, Soil and Water Conservation Districts, large agricultural operations, and OSU Extension.
- I think our 10<sup>th</sup> Bill of Rights gives the responsibility to the states and if it is private property it should be the responsibility of the private owner. Farmers don't want to destroy the land it is their life.
- The community (all members) wanting to preserve their rural environment and the health of their environment for children and future (clean water, clean air, etc.) Community planning for future-long term the land will become more valuable. State government could have a role as helper.
- Local population: If they are not acting responsibly then I believe it is the responsibility of local, state, and federal government in order to protect resources so that our children can enjoy and future generations will have the resources they need.
- The U.S. government should totally back off and leave the farmers alone - they have a proven track record of excellence in environmental protection. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service doesn't.
- Farmers need to maintain their property as agriculture use. Little of any government control is needed. Maintain zoning as agriculture.

- The Darby area owes much of its pristine nature to the agriculture activities that have taken place in the past and present. These areas should not be publically taken over, but continued good practices should be encouraged.
- Farmers, environmentalists, developers, and government.
- Every landowner in the Little Darby Creek Watershed is going to get older and grow old. They should remember that these threats will outlast their lives. They need to think ahead for they will most certainly come under temptation to sell property to people who will resell to poison “lawn care” types. If they let things slide somebody will sell.
- County and state zoning to keep out the residential and manufacturing would be a good solution. This would need to be overseen to be sure there are no zoning variances which could be swayed by payoffs to local officials or others involved. It is primarily the responsibility of the landowners to use their best judgement to preserve what they have and preserve it for themselves and others.
- The local community with guidance from environmental experts.
- All parties directly affected/involved in the issues and to lesser extent, other outside parties concerned with the outcome.
- Townspeople, Dept. of Natural Resources, Ohio EPA, state preservation group. We appreciate greatly your help!
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ohio EPA, U.S. citizens.
- Systematic national standards limiting the scale of risks to adjacent landowners and during storms/floods to provide level playing field. Strong state monitoring for compliance. County level decisions within level state and national guidance.
- Ultimately, the responsibility is the landowners but, government need to make doing the right thing easy and financially realistic.
- The only threat to the area is a governmental desire to strip the Darby people of their lands! How do they get the government out of there?
- The primary responsibility of addressing these threats falls to the local governments who should create, maintain and enforce land-use plans that protect both agriculture and natural habitat while allowing certain environmentally sensitive projects to continue. It is the responsibility of the state and federal governments to monitor hunting and fishing restrictions as well as limits on both air and water pollution.
- Government needs to remember, farmers controlled land conservation before this country existed. They still know what is best as their prosperity depends on it. Allow them to handle it.
- Local government (trustees and county commissioner).
- Ideally, zoning and planning section of the local governments. More realisti-



cally, lawsuits brought by environmental organizations.

- Citizens of Ohio and their elected representatives.
- The city and county zoning authorities should have cooperatively developed long term plans for “smart growth”. The county should have a watershed authority whose responsibility is to develop a fair and sensible plan for allocation, cleaning, accumulating of area water resources.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- The government at all levels and the local people. Unfortunately there is not enough will at the local level to curb or channel development to preserve the resources and protect from these threats.
- I think Senator DeWine was on the right track (i.e., Ohio). The large farming institutions, conservative farmers, folks who sell their land for large sums of money irresponsible to the environmental needs of the Darby Watershed. These farmers were obviously fearful of “big government” that could have established a National Wildlife Refuge.
- It is the responsibility of the individual to use common sense not willful ignorance in realizing that the refuge proposal would have benefitted all unions. It is the responsibility of the government to put forth a fair and reasonable proposal (which was done).
- All government agencies from the local park service to the federal government. I believe it is wrong for the federal agencies to withdraw from the project.
- Individual and partnered landowners with local and state officials/agencies making available essential resources and tools.
- The concept of a federal wildlife refuge seems to have failed. I guess the next hope is strong regional zoning and vigorous enforcement of environmental legislation.
- I thought it should be federal government but, now it will be local community, landowners, city of Columbus, creek watchdog groups and metro parks.
- Farmers have always valued their land and creeks, I think this will continue. Wildlife is very important to them.
- The state is most responsible. The state legislature should pass new laws making sprawl pay it own way. Right now it is subsidized by the taxpayers in many ways. If it wasn't subsidized it would greatly decrease.
- The U.S. Justice Department is there to protect the wrong-doers of the Executive Branch, so they cannot be counted upon to protect rural America from bad (whether intentional or not) activities aimed at (against) rural America. The rural people should decide what is best for rural America. After all, they live there.

- Individuals also organizations like Sierra Club, Bureau of Land Management, young people in Jr. High bio-science classes, agriculture extension stations, Scouts, C.A.R.
- Individuals, local governments, federal and state agencies.
- Agencies responsible have a poor track record in protecting watersheds and preserving water quality. They will have to do better if the Little Darby is to be saved. That's why the inclusion of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would have been helpful. Now we have to rely upon agencies like USACE, Ohio EPA, SWCDs, and local planning agencies, not known for strong advocacy.
- The USDA, county and town zoning boards, the Ohio EPA and Ohio Dept. of Natural Resources, local citizen groups and conservation groups.
- Local farmers and local officials.
- Everyone is responsible. Oversight should probably be done one of the natural resource departments in the state would be the likely choice.
- Governor, state legislature, officials in Columbus and other adjacent communities, state DNR, local landowners, and local government officials.
- Federal authorities if local and state government is not interested.
- It would be nice if they threats were addressed by property owners but, this would require cooperation, community spirit, and toughest of all, a diminution of greed. I am not optimistic concerning the prospects. Local elected officials have shown the spines of worms.
- Any man or woman in this country who still values freedom.
- Local government - the higher government doesn't understand the position of the local people, farmers, etc. They are trying to satisfy the city people.
- Governments - local, state, and federal.
- It's like to think responsible corporate development would protect all groups, however, this is naive and not actionable under current conditions. As such, a government, state or federal, should handle it.
- Local city governments, NRCS, and Soil and Water Conservation Districts.
- I would hope that our elected officials and government officials would have our best interest in mind and not be influenced by big money and private interests. Ultimately, the threat is to the farmer but, how can he address it without deep pockets?
- Community leaders need a long term plan for land use/development, including retail space, schools, housing.
- Farmers need education and accountability for responsible use of pesticides and fertilizers.

- Residents, farmers, businesses need education and accountability for water conservation and usage.
- Local state and federal government agencies and citizens.
- The private land owner is responsible for his/her own property.
- Ohio DNR, property owners, and local governments.
- The state government must adopt stricter wetland preservation laws and zoning restrictions to prevent development in the upper Darby watershed. I really don't trust local government bodies - most don't have the staff or expertise to study the ecological implications of various strategies.
- Farmers and land owners.
- It is each persons responsibility and it would help if there were "natural" education available for free.
- Local government such as county commissioners.
- It can only fall to the government. Specifically, the federal government to find the ways and means to prevail on behalf of the rest of us, our descendants, and the environment. How else would the great parks and preserves in this country ever have been developed? By farmers? Some issues and ideas are too big and too valuable to be entrusted to little narrow minds and selfish individuals and greedy corporate bottom-liners. Who watches out for the greater good? Farmers?
- Shut down U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Congress.
- Government – by providing funds to purchase easements and zoning to limit development. Conservation organizations purchasing land.
- U.S. Government, USDA; State, ODA, ODNR, ODOT; counties and townships; municipalities; non-profit organizations. Everyone is responsible, not one group.
- USFWS can use its clout to convince Ohio EPA, The Nature Conservancy, and local environmental NGOs to actively push for sensible protection measures.
- Local, county, state, and federal agricultural agencies or develop a group of people from these areas to monitor the watershed.

## **6. What are elements of a fair and sensible approach to addressing these threats?**

- We need to strive toward a compromise, a win-win situation. We need to be open and honest about what can be accomplished. The government in all its phases, local, state, and federal has not always been straight forward and honest in their dealings with local citizens. There is an underlying fear of

government control and interference. Trust needs to be developed on both sides.

- Township to enact zoning so farms stay farms and not be split to housing projects.
- We have a least 25 acres along Little Darby which cannot be planted so they use a natural preservation for wildlife. Other farms must have similar situations.
- Stewards of the Darby and similar groups have done a good job of this. Without them, you and Senator DeWine would not have known about the Darby.
- There is not excuse for destroying natural preserves. If developers continue this way no one will be able to enjoy nature at its best.
- That is a local decision for the local landowner residents.
- Maybe a depression in real estate market in central Ohio.
- Eliminating the federal government's involvement in state and local issues.
- Nothing will be seen as fair - what nature needs should be number one priority now. The area is growing too fast and if we wait it will be too late.
- Discussion and examination - long range planning.
- Sound overall planning. Provide ways for property owners to preserve/ enhance the natural character of this land through land purchases and development rights.
- Conservation easements, preservation of sensitive areas and stream corridor.
- Increased land purchase by local metro park system. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service involvement in some capacity - too much knowledge there to lose.
- Keep talking and don't let the issues be ignored or discussion postponed.
- The federal agencies abide by constitutional constraints.
- Purchase of development rights.
- Adhere to the constitution. Good education and use of our agriculture colleges in getting out goo, scientific information.
- I attended one meeting with landowners and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and game representatives. It was "emotion packed" and the landowners seemed completely close-minded. I cant' imagine breaking through.
- Land purchase or easements is the only solution.
- Public participation.

- Agreement contracts between land owners and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to preserve the status quo or to sell land only to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- I believe the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service proposal included fair and sensible proposals. Unfortunately, inaccurate portrayals of the proposal resulted in its undoing.
- Broad range of inputs, public meetings and discussions.
- Education. Electing responsible people into government and responsible positions. Being able to identify those people is often a problem for the little man (person).
- Education on agriculture and nature preserves.
- Communications with local landowners - teeth in the laws against development and pollution.
- Needs of landowners - role of government in zoning and planning. Awareness of Darby as a national treasure by citizens of central Ohio and beyond.
- Disallow growth, sale of watershed land for any use but responsible farming or preservation.
- An integrated approach with all relevant stakeholders - its messy, complicated, and slow but, it's the fair and sensible way.
- Input by all stakeholders. Moratorium on commercial development. Land trust.
- Probably working individually with property owners, one at a time, promoting (advertising, persuading, convincing) responsible, ecologically sound farming and natural resource conservation practices. Promote school use of portions of LDC for science labs. Are there tax or other monetary incentives possible for the farmers and property owners who behave responsibly?
- Some kind of land trust will be necessary. Otherwise, somebody will most certainly succumb to temptation. Ecological destruction begins with just one sale and in most cases the buyer appears to be a nice person. He probably believes that he is a nice person and he does deceive some people.
- The U.S. Constitution provides that private property may be taken for a public purpose subject to provision to the property owner of just compensation and due process of law. In short, eminent domain should be used to condemn and secure any property or property rights necessary to protect the watershed, once it has been determined that such protection is a public purpose. Private efforts at purchase, such as those of The Nature Conservancy, should also be supported.
- Land use legislation that addresses preservation of natural environments.
- Co-existence with private landowners, state owned land, buffer zone, Darby Creek Watershed.

- Zoning protects interests of existing uses. Education aimed at helping people understand the negative impacts of stream-side erosion over use of pesticides, removal of vegetation etc. Tax abatements for conservation easements.
- Be inclusive, involve citizens and landowners.
- Pass the proper laws, write supportive regulations, enforce them, punish those who object.
- Establish tax benefits for agricultural and conservation protection. Limit the size of subdivisions. Require that subdivisions are located away from streams and that they devote more than 50 percent of their land for conservation purposes. Establish a refuge with support of U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the state and The Nature Conservancy.
- Stricter zoning regulations incorporating limits on sub-dividing and better enforcement.
- Voluntary easements purchase by government. Offers to purchase critical habitat at fair prices to willing sellers.
- Watershed based zoning and environmental enforcement.
- Local government control, not federal.
- Education by several groups including the Dept. of Interior, USDA, and state agencies. The bigger problem is more basic. A profound lack of education in civics and the role of government. It is not the government's job to take someone's land for another's use.
- Financial incentives to landowners such as fir compensation for conservation/development rights.
- Educate residents on sceptics about the threat to the Darby and their own drinking water wells, and how to maintain their systems. Financial assistance for seceding, to residents. Regulation of factory farms. Columbus relaxing its no-sewers-without-annexation policy. Zoning overlays that encourage appropriate land use and BMP's. Opportunities to purchase and retire development rights.
- Issues should be decided on as locally as possible and with the least amount of government intervention, especially the federal government - not the feds place to be the land barons.
- Learning options - majority consensus.
- Getting heavy-handed government regulation off the table.
- Being attuned to the wishes of the landowners. Listening to landowners thoughts, ideas and needs.
- Encouragement to eliminate these threats. Keeping in mind private property rights.

- Require environmental impact statements; hold public hearings.
- Zoning would be a fair and sensible approach, this wouldn't mandate that if the land were sold it would have to be to the government, but just as in the city people can't put a factory or an animal barn in a neighborhood because it would be a problem for others, the protection of the Darby Watershed land should be protected from development because of the problems it would cause for others.
- Rational thought.
- Bringing all the players together to voice their concerns, hopefully to reach an agreeable compromise, with an impartial mediator to direct or focus the discussions.
- Must address land use and break up of farms. Recommend testing other streams that run through or by development areas to see detrimental effects of increased runoff, etc.
- Ensure all activities support a healthy and sustainable Darby ecosystem.
- Application of the "Precautionary Principle". Consideration of what is being made available to a future generation and which is sustainable: public ownership or industrial ownership. Partnership among state, local, and national interests.
- I think permanent conservation easements should be continually purchased from willing landowners by a state/county partnership funded by the federal governments easements, once purchased, should be held and monitored by local non-profit land trusts whenever possible. The state run PACE program has been a huge success but, the state cannot possibly afford to purchase the necessary easements for this large of an area. Such a program would be highly effective and much less expensive than the original plan I would think.
- Truthfulness, integrity, the Golden Rule - by government employees, agencies, and a fellow American!
- Create a minimum limit on the number of acres to be sold between parties to limit the diving of agricultural lands into smaller residential lots. Create and enforce no hunting and no fishing areas in places that are ecologically sensitive - animal breeding or nesting grounds, watering holes, etc. Limit the expansion and creation of roadways.
- Give landowners who keep their land undeveloped tax incentives. Create a zone along all waterways in the watershed in which no buildings could be constructed, perhaps two hundred feet from each bank.
- Consult farming organizations when the government plans changes.
- All elements are in place with local government.
- Open planning. Careful enforcement of well written laws. Input considered by members effected rather than by economic concerns.

- A statewide referendum on the subject.
- The “watershed authority” decision making board should be made up of the diverse stakeholders in this region e.g., homeowners, industrialists, environmentalists, farmers, chemists, etc.
- Prohibiting growth for private economic gain even though some people won’t like that.
- Development controls with compensation to affected landowners for restrictions that might apply to their land. Economic incentives to develop less rather than more.
- I do not have the political or environmental savvy to know what to do. It seems The Nature Conservancy, the Sierra Club, the Audubon Society, etc. should have input. Ohio does not seem to have much sensibility about the Little Darby and needs to listen.
- Education, public awareness, and ensuring all voices are heard not just the loudest.
- Private ownership is not compatible with protection of the land.
- Careful consideration of all program options, commensurate with goals, with emphasis on pros and cons of alternative strategies. Arriving at a consensus, at the local level and formalizing it by way of a (county) ballot referendum.
- Regulating sprawl. Encouraging farmland preservation. Maybe a mechanism to purchase development rights or easements.
- State and local initiatives, environmental education at all levels, watchdog group for Darby Creek, fair intelligent press coverage, dedication to project, possible reward system, personal responsibility on everyone’s part, and accountability.
- Stop taxpayer subsidization of sprawl.
- If you would adapt my plan it would save mega bucks and years and appease the farmers. All you need is 40 or 50 feet on back side of the stream to catch the poison the farmers put on their crops. This would filter all of it out, still have room for picnicking, cycle paths and any other recreation. I have a farm and two other properties involved in the watershed. If you could send someone to talk to me, I will explain it better. I am almost 85 years old, crippled, 90 percent blind, deaf but, I have grandchildren that need clean water and air.
- I don’t think there is one. I would not be fair to any business interests - only to protection of natural world around us. In our own county, township, on our own land, if we own any. Get personal interest or gain out.
- Identifying the natural resources which should be protected. Identify the “human” resources worth preserving. Establish zoning, easements, tax-breaks that do the same. Establish key natural resource protection goals.



- Your emphasis on local community planning puts undue power in the hands of economic interests who would be willing to compromise the long-term integrity of the meek for short-term economic gains. A far more sensible approach would have been to have established a national wildlife refuge. You abrogated your responsibility.
- Guidelines for development designed to protect the riparian corridors, requiring some undeveloped area next to the streams, perhaps preserving a larger corridor as a park or agriculture area. Tax breaks or other incentives for farmers to keep land in agriculture or as natural areas, while recognizing their rights as property owners.
- Keep the national government out of it.
- Some form of compromise.
- Anti-sprawl legislation at state and local level.
- Funding for easement purchases.
- Encouragement of locals to participate in federal and state conservation programs i.e., conservation set-asides.
- Regulations protecting stream banks, ditches, etc.
- Restrictions on mowing roadsides in spring and early summer.
- Establishing a voluntary program to purchase land for a wildlife refuge in this unique area.
- Listen to the people involved.
- Zoning; conservation easements; cooperation between Ohio EPA, Ohio Dept. of Agriculture, property owners, and local and state groups that appreciate the uniqueness of the ecosystem and value both the services it provides and the ecosystem and all its creatures.
- If city people want to move to the country they need to sign something that they will not complain or want to change things. Example - sometimes there are smells they don't like and farm machinery has to travel on roads, etc.
- Working with the landowners with incentives and subsidies to keep the land in its natural state.
- Gathering community input (as your doing). Developing option that includes fair compensation for farmers, land in trust, agriculture or park use only.
- Stricter zoning laws and enforcement. Voluntariness of program. Incentives for participation.
- Buy from a willing seller. Don't take land by eminent domain.
- A long range plan for further development.

- An educational program/plan to enable residents, businesses and farmers to manage their homes/work in environmentally responsible manners.
- Rewards (tax reductions/rebates) for environmentally responsible practices.
- Punishments (fines/loss of licenses) for irresponsible practices.
- Enforcing current environmental protection laws, looking for ways to improve usage of land and water (this does not include “development”) and preserve threatened areas for the future.
- No federal intervention from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Those people/industries who pollute must clean up; they must pay and developers must pay impact fee.
- Increasing the dollar amounts available for conservation easements for farmers and stepping up the purchase of land from willing sellers by the state with nature preserve check-off funds and by such groups as The Nature Conservancy, Wildlife Land Trust, American Farmland Trust, etc. Because Ohio has no wilderness areas and ranks near the bottom in public lands, we risk turning into a continuous commercial strip.
- Education which is free and on-going. Financial incentives and prizes for good stewardship and conservation practices.
- Total local control by the farmers affected.
- I have no earthly idea. I doubt if any approach would ever be perceived as “fair and sensible” unless the government gave the greedy landowners ten times the market value for their acreage or maybe ten times what the developers would pay. I’m afraid nothing but huge projects would satisfy the farmers broken hearts over losing their beloved family farms. Have you seen the “for sale” signs going up since the “defeat” of the Darby Refuge? How about the mega dairy operations? Such sweet little family farms.
- Shutting down the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Place a development hex on the whole Big Darby Watershed.
- Openness; media coverage; testimony by experts on all sides; equal time and consideration for all sides.
- Overcome differences with farmers! Respect their opinions, they too are Stewards of the land
- Having town meetings to discuss the issues with representatives from local, county, state, and federal agencies. Keep in mind what is good for the total area.

**7. What would indicate to you that those developing a plan to deal with the threats you have identified above really have listened to your input and do care about what you say?**

- I'm not sure since I do not live in the immediate area but am interested in conservation efforts as a member of The Nature Conservancy. Making some concessions to my viewpoints and needs would indicate you have listened to my input.
- Publish new zoning proposals in media (newspaper, tv).
- Continuation of conservation measures already in place. Use local zoning.
- Stewards of the Darby and Ohio Dept. of Natural Resources plus my state legislators have been extremely responsive. Senator DeWine rarely pays any serious attention to opposition views. U.S. Fish and Wildlife all too often steam rolls local issues and proceeds with their agenda.
- Your interest in visiting the area indicates that to me, but the landowners will oppose any plan. I find it very discouraging that they have "won".
- The area would remain as it is, untouched.
- I have no right to input on the Darby as I do not own property in that area.
- I believe the persons responsible for the governments land grab do not care what I think at all.
- Final establishment of a wildlife refuge in Madison County.
- Actual preservation/enhancement of the natural and agricultural environment.
- If a meaningful, implementable plan is formed, I will be convinced. A paper-only exercise - unconvincing.
- Stop with the insane talk of international/U.N. conspiracies or even local conspiracy thoughts regarding Columbus, etc., etc., and actually implement BMP's on their land.
- Farmers listen to nobody.
- Your follow up indicates your interest. I fear once U.S. Fish and Wildlife backs out that no one will continue addressing the issues.
- In this case the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is withdrawing it proposal. Congratulations. Let this be the first of many similar steps.
- Nothing - or federal agencies would not be involved.
- I believe there is a general dislike for big government in rural areas. It reminded me of the movie "The Russians are coming, the Russians are coming"!

- Holding public seminars/meetings and a published response to all comments/viewpoints.
- I don't have any information on this.
- Public forums, printed reports, listening meetings, all of which U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service did in abundance.
- Factual responses.
- This letter on questionnaire suggests there are people still interested in preserving wildlife and habitat, etc. The local metro park system I volunteer for has been active in buying land for additional parks.
- Information on your plans.
- Legal restrictions on development and financial incentives to keep the character of the watershed.
- I have no idea. I have read that county commissioners have approved a subdivision in the watershed - no doubt the first of many?
- A broad based group with strong representation from environmental activists and a clear statement of the commitment to avoid development and protect the natural health and beauty of the watershed.
- A representative voice of stakeholders being heard in a public forum would be a good first indicated.
- Stop urban sprawl. Scientific data to show improvement in water quality and related living things.
- Farmers who farm responsibly neither selling out to developers nor trashing the banks of LDC. Property owners who reserve part of their land bordering LDC for a natural barrier. Property owners who open their portion of LDC to school science lab study by schools.
- What their plans say? Plans should change during their development. New information does require revisions if the information is actually heard. Putative plans should reflect both growth and change as planners assimilate new information.
- After the debacle of the Darby Wildlife Refuge, and after witnessing its defeat by a handful of ignorant hostile rubes, supported by a knotheaded Congresswoman (theirs and mine, unfortunately), despite polls by The Nature Conservancy which found that 70 percent of the voters in Ohio supported the Refuge, I have absolutely no illusion about 1) who will develop any such plan, or 2) about how they will value my opinion. This is not to say that I wouldn't like to see another effort at preservation, one which truly considers all views.
- Results!

- Nothing yet, except perhaps Mike DeWines nod in the right direction.
- If they recognize that the preservation of agricultural lands, wildlife habitat and open space are worthy objectives. If agricultural, wildlife habitats and open space are assigned an equal economic value to subdivisions.
- New zoning regulations.
- I already believe you are listening.
- Area-wide planning, with equal voting powers for townships and counties, no forced annexation to Columbus to have sanitary sewers.
- When the federal government stops taking large tracts of land for whatever reason they can think of.
- Personal contact, visits and explanations from key decision makers directly to affected landowners before any general public information disseminated. Number public meetings, well advertised and at convenient hours to attend for people who work daily. Experts on how concerns are addressed. Key - early stakeholder involvement.
- I don't think the Federal government listens; I think they have an agenda to control all open land and then create easements on people's private property.
- Response from representative putting land planning on ballot.
- If the land in question is maintained as agriculture in nature.
- Planning and land management practices that encourage good practices and watch and possibly legislate threats such as certain manufacturing, housing, etc.
- By listing the prevalent concerns and showing action.
- Not much - money talks, bull\*\*\*\* walks.
- Because I'm not directly involved with the area (i.e., am an outside party) I don't really feel my opinions are critical to whatever plan is proposed.
- Because money and lobbyist talk and Columbus has some extremely wealthy and influential people wanting to benefit from the open release of these lands.
- Water quality and bio-assays showed constant or improving levels.
- When they actually start purchasing development rights in the Little Darby Watershed.
- Reverse the land grabs all over America and stop the cancer that is destroying America from within: "so called environmentalism"!

- If the people who were developing the plan clearly stated how and why they came to each decision and provided reasons for and against all proposals, I would believe they would have listened to my ideas.
- Local control of local events.
- Actually implementing environmentally wise and informed policy.
- If the matter appeared on the ballot.
- I'm not sure. Perhaps a system or process that guarantees appeals/grievances heard. Perhaps goals stated/formulated that would be accomplished in 10 years. (Examples: percentage of pollution in groundwater; percentage of farmland; percentage of land in housing; percentage of land as wetland; etc.)
- Nothing. I wish you had not withdrawn your proposal for a refuge. I think that was the only way this area was going to be saved.
- Nothing, for the most part people pay lip service to dealing with threats and everyone wants to make sure they get the money "due" to them when they decide its time to sell their land. No one wants the solutions to affect their pocket book.
- I am impressed by your efforts to establish this questionnaire. The very nature of rural Ohio, its disappearance in fact, the loss of small farms, the impact of development, are a test to real voices being heard. I applaud your efforts and further education!
- I think the refuge proposal was about as fair and reasoned a proposal as any. The idiots that opposed it only opposed it due to greed not fairness or concern for the natural resources. They didn't want fair market value they wanted way more than the market would bear.
- Assurance of long-term results.
- When and if the few landowners protecting their future profits when they sell to developers, lose control of the debate about the future of the area. What I have seen so far has been an effective campaign of misleading the public about what this issue is all about.
- The future condition of Darby Creek Watershed. After all, not just landowners feel the effects. All of central Ohio does but, all of central Ohio didn't get listened to.
- If your upcoming report is honest and specific, that would indicate it.
- The people I met while in Ohio made a very good impression with me as very decent and very responsible type people. Such good people do care.
- Watch to see if some farm land is being sold to developers.

- My involvement has been with EPA study of central watershed like the Darby.
- A moratorium on building permits. A moratorium on new highway construction.
- Restoration of wetlands. Restoration of prairies.
- Strong riparian setback ordinances that are enforced.
- If the local and state government, farmers, developers, and conservationists are all involved in the planning process and document preparation that would help the plan succeed. Perhaps a referendum on the final plan would help as well.
- If the local farmers and landowners are allowed to continue to exercise their freedom everything will be okay.
- Success however small in protecting this area will indicate to me that I was listened to.
- Action by the Ohio EPA and Department of Interior.
- Everyone wants or says we have to have progress but many of us like and want to live and keep the rural county as it is. I don't believe the higher ups will listen. They do what they want and keep moving us out.
- By keeping it from being developed.
- Seeing elements raised by both camps addressed, ultimately the nature side "winning" as the unique ecosystem is preserved.
- Inclusion of suggestions in a local land use plan and suggestions for implementation.
- Save the taxpayers money. Save the farmland.
- The plan in print. New laws for environmental preservation. Incentives for responsible resource use. Classes available locally. Reduced prices or free (subsidized) organic or non-harmful herbicides, cleansers, fertilizers (a grant perhaps?).
- That private landowners have the ability to bring charges against trespassers on their land.
- Actual on-the-ground results, such as a moratorium on road building or the removal of roads where possible.
- More public meetings announced well in advance and better publicized in the media.
- It would be a fine thing to have an environmental president and congress. It would be a good thing to use the wealth of this nation for preserving it and not destroying other countries with our military machinery.

- No plan needed by outsiders! Farmer control through local government.
- Not folding under the pressure of the whining farmers would be a start. Somebody who else but the federal government, has to take the high moral ground. The few non-farmers around here, who care about the preservation issues, are yelled at, intimidated, threatened, and ostracized if we even attempt to speak up about our own beliefs and opinions. As a public servant I personally have to be mindful of taking a public stance on “political” issues.
- That enhancement of natural ecosystems would be considered a valid conservation alternative.
- Ohio law enacted that charges developers when traffic congestion increases and auto pollution worsens. Make exploitive land profiteers pay and I will believe the government listened.
- Explain to me the pros and cons or threat in a letter and ask my comment

**8. Please check any of the following areas that you believe should be addressed in any local conservation action initiative or that would enhance any such initiative:**

The numbers listed below in each area reflect the total number selected by individuals surveyed.

Other issues/areas that need to be addressed in any local initiative:

- I would suggest, as I imagine a number of others already have, that you contact the Ohio Chapter of The Nature Conservancy because of their interest in preserving the Darby Creek Watershed as one of Ohio’s last great places.
- Impact of various alternatives on the land owners and most importantly the natural resources, i.e., if we do this and so what is the probable impact on the land and land owners involved. You have a difficult job.
- Local zoning and enforcement of same.
- Unique character of the ecosystem and our responsibility to preserve it.

**Table 2: Topics Important to Individuals Living Outside of Madison and Union Counties**

65 Landowner rights	69 Landowner incentives	88 Preservation of the rural character or the area
79 Preservation of farmland	92 Preservation of the stream corridor	79 Role of the individual landowner
77 Role of County govt.	71 Role of State govt.	63 Role of Federal govt.
78 Environmental education opportunities	47 Partnership opportunities	58 Development and its compatibility with preservation of agriculture and natural resources
52 Hunting & fishing Opportunities		



- Long range effects of current decision making.
- Any initiative must address subdivision and residential development in order to protect the area.
- Real estate developers and absentee landowners have no interest in conserving the area.
- Zoning, comprehensive planning (and strength of those two items), prairie restoration (such as pilot see growing program).
- Complete protection of property owners rights.
- You should work with local preservation organizations to buy or get environmental easements for this area.
- What the true total cost (i.e., to the environment, etc.) of development is.
- Timing is always an issue. Perhaps metro parks etc., can play a part in obtaining land and keeping it from developers. How do you keep developers with large sources of money from building malls, housing projects, etc.?
- Role of local landowners critical. Do they care about the Darby? Role of government ins strictly defining and limiting land use and developments.
- Tax abatements or incentives for preservation of farmland and against development. Local involvement in natural resource management.
- "Outsiders" do make a difference. Ecotours can bring money and jobs into a community whose natural assets are sufficient to facilitate them. Did you know that yours could qualify?
- Any such initiative should involve citizens from all of Central Ohio, and rally, all of the state and all levels of government, not just the local residents and their immediate elected officials.
- Multi-use pathway for walking, biking, blading, and jogging.
- Environmental enforcement.
- Stakeholder involvement in each step of the decision making process, starting at the very earliest stages - discussion of various alternatives and their long range implications.
- Balanced presentation of the issues in all the schools of the watershed. Watershed identification signs and markers to help people recognize and assume stewardship for.
- Private property rights while still protecting the environment.
- Making information available to all citizens so those concerned with any aspect of the plan can become aware and involved in the method of their choosing.

- Bio-diversity.
- The non-sustainability of the new crop subsidy programs and probability of the new conservation reserves.
- Let the only initiative be private! The Little Darby people have and are the best stewards of that land.
- The role of third party organizations that may try to influence local landowners (i.e., environmental and development groups).
- Further impact on neighboring owners, both economic and environmental.
- Controlling growth and development - do they really want the rampant sprawl and associated problems that are all too common throughout central Ohio?
- Perhaps farmers and property owners along the Little Darby Creek need monetary or educational incentives. I do not know how this could be attained.
- My bet is in ten years the Darby will no longer be an exceptional warm water habitat and that the greed and profits envisioned by the vocal opposition will not be realized as factory farms drive their property values down not up.
- Farmland should be bought by public agencies and leased back to farmers. Only if the conservation agency holds title of the land may the conservation efforts be successful.
- Education of landowners in applicable real estate law topics such as conservation easements, restrictive covenants, etc. Identification of means/methods by which rehabilitation of older structures becomes the preferred alternative to "building new". Providing revenue for local programs, given the "smaller" tax base of rural areas.
- Now that local land owners have managed to get the federal government out of the deal, local conservation interests will have to differentiate between ecological conservation and unlimited sprawl that will occur if there is no intervention from the status quo.
- Zoning and planning.
- Enlist seniors as volunteers to watch over parks and do some guided tours. Isn't "Highbanks" in this area (Madison or Union)? I'll never forget the bluebirds and Indian earthwork and trees in fall.
- Water quality/urban interface/ecological stability and biology (ecosystem "rights") of watershed.
- Forget about volunteer initiatives, I want powerful land use controls like they have in the Adirondacks of New York, forever wild.
- This is a farming and livestock raising area. Please don't inhibit this best use of land and resources.

- The tone of all meetings needs to be respectful and tolerant. People who abuse others verbally or otherwise need to be removed. The process by which the opponents of the refuge won the fight left me deeply pessimistic that much can be done out there. But, thanks to Fish and Wildlife Service for their noble efforts.
- Give control to city, county, and state in that order.
- Landowners need to “put up or shut up” i.e., talk of interest in commitment to protecting farmland and watershed must be put into action by landowners. It is up to them to step up and decide what, if anything, they are as a group, willing to do.
- Anytime the private landowner enters into a partnership with a government entity, the private landowner ultimately loses.
- Don’t use the farm land for refuges (it already is) or for more housing. Soon there will be no farms and no available or affordable food.
- I think all of the reasons in question eight will be sufficient.
- Funding of any initiative.
- Federal/local funding available to meet compliance if available. Environmentally friendly business opportunities instead of “dirty businesses” (boating/camping verses manufacturing).
- The health of the land and our natural heritage comes first!
- Up to the local farmers.
- If local government is involved, restrictions should be placed on local government from higher levels. Local zoning is a very weak conservation measure – zoning can be changed to easily. Permanent protection of ecosystem is needed.
- Too much development for short-term benefits (i.e., too many shopping centers that are profitable for short periods of time).
- Do not let anti-environmentalists divide and conquer; the bad guys too often win the PR battle.
- Opening the area with a trail or (trails) and parking lot so the nature interested people can get into the area and see why it is so special.

## Appendix 2: Conservation Examples



## Watershed Group Profiles

[Home](#) \* [Community-Based Watershed Mgt.](#) \* [Ohio Watershed Academy](#) \* [Watershed Group Profiles](#) \* [Resources](#)

### Watershed Group Profiles

#### Sunday Creek Watershed Group (Sunday Creek)

**Contact Name:** Jennifer Shimala

**Job Title:** Coordinator

**Address:**

69 High Street  
Glouster, OH 45732

**County:** Perry, Athens, Morgan

**Phone:** (740) 767-2225

**Fax:** (740) 767-2225

**Email:** [scwg@frognets.net](mailto:scwg@frognets.net)

**Website:** [www.sundaycreek.org](http://www.sundaycreek.org)

#### Profile:

Mission Statement:

"The Sunday Creek Watershed Group is committed to restoring and preserving water quality through community interaction, conservation, and education; in pursuit of a healthy ecosystem capable of supporting biodiversity and recreation."

The Sunday Creek Watershed encompasses 139 square miles in Perry, Athens, and Morgan Counties. Our watershed group is sponsored by Rural Action a membership based, non-profit organizational working together to revitalize Appalachia Ohio. The Sunday Creek Watershed Group currently operates through an EPA 319 planning grant. Types of water quality impairment found in Sunday Creek include acid mine drainage, improperly treated waste water, sedimentation, and illegally dumped trash. Current restoration projects include trash removal, tree plantings, and stream bank stabilization projects. Future acid mine drainage restoration projects will include three subsidence (subsidence is a hole created through the collapse of an abandoned coal mine roof) closure projects located in the headwaters of Sunday Creek. Closing these subsidence features will eliminate approximately 170 million gallons of water per

year from entering into the deep coal mined area. Thus, reducing the generation of acid mine drainage in the deep mines which then enters Sunday Creek.

[Return to list of all Group Profiles](#)

<http://ohiowatersheds.osu.edu>



# Watershed Group Profiles

[Home](#) \* [Community-Based Watershed Mgt.](#) \* [Ohio Watershed Academy](#) \* [Watershed Group Profiles](#) \* [Resources](#)

## Watershed Group Profiles

### Little Beaver Creek Watershed (Little Beaver Creek)

**Affiliation:** Columbiana Soil & Water Conservation District

**Address:**

1834-B South Lincoln Avenue  
Salem, OH 44460

**County:** Columbiana

**Phone:** (330) 332-8732

**Website:** [www.columbiana.oh.nacdnet.org](http://www.columbiana.oh.nacdnet.org)

#### Profile:

The Little Beaver Creek Watershed protection project began in 1999 with a CWA Section 319 grant obtained by Columbiana SWCD and match partners. The goals of the grant have been carried out leading to the beginning of several conservation practices and the understanding of the watershed concept. This project, the first of its kind in the county, is the beginning of a new strategy in planning for the future of this and surrounding watersheds.

Our greatest achievement to date is the protection of nearly 1400 acres of riparian corridor along the Wild and Scenic River designations of Little Beaver Creek with approximately 100 acres more pending further into the watershed. We also have several landowners interested in agricultural easements.

The largest goal of the project is education concerning this new concept and the effects of non-point source pollution. Many of the schools as well as civic groups have had guest speakers on the subject. The schools have been dedicating parts of the school year to study these concepts and several of them are constructing outdoor classrooms or land labs. The civic groups are helping to sponsor events such as our annual River Sweep clean-up day.

Currently, the Watershed Coordinator and the 319 Advisory Board are writing a draft Watershed Management Plan. The next step will be to obtain public input and support of the plan so that it can be finalized and implemented.

The Section319 grant will end in June 2002. At this time we are seeking funding from the Clean Ohio Fund to continue our efforts in protecting our shared natural resources.

[Return to list of all Group Profiles](#)

<http://ohiowatersheds.osu.edu>





# Watershed Group Profiles

[Home](#) \* [Community-Based Watershed Mgt.](#) \* [Ohio Watershed Academy](#) \* [Watershed Group Profiles](#) \* [Resources](#)

## Watershed Group Profiles

### Stillwater Watershed Project (Stillwater River)

**Contact Name:** Nikki Reese

**Job Title:** Coordinator

**Affiliation:** Stillwater Watershed Project

**Address:**

1117 South Towne Court  
Greenville, OH 45331

**County:** Darke, Miami

**Phone:** (937) 548-1752

**Fax:** (937) 548-2925

**Email:** [nikki-reese@oh.nacdn.org](mailto:nikki-reese@oh.nacdn.org)

### **Profile:**

Stillwater River Watershed (673 square miles)

Located in West Central Ohio with 75% of the watershed contained in Darke and Miami Counties. 80% of the watershed is cropland.

Raised over \$2 million for the SWP. Of that \$2 million, approximately \$1.4 million is earmarked to go directly to landowners as cost share or incentive payments for best management practices (BMPs).

To insure that the Stillwater River will be enjoyed by future generations, the Stillwater Watershed Project was formed through the cooperation of local citizens, government agencies, municipalities, and organizations. Our goal is to protect and enhance the ground and surface water resource base through voluntary land use practices that are both practical and economical. What needs to be done in the watershed includes the following: reduce soil erosion, encourage proper manure management, restore wetlands, reduce septic loading and restore riparian corridors.

Areas of specialization: working with Ohio EPAs 319 grants, permanent

conservation easements, BMPs related to livestock and soil erosion, restoring riparian corridors and the following educational events: septic system/lawn care workshop, aquatic adventure camp, canoe floats, conservation tillage breakfast, tillage field day.

The SWP was formed in the early 1990s by the Darke and Miami Soil and Water Conservation Districts (SWCDs) due to the large number of livestock, the high percent of highly erodible cropland and the nitrate alerts in the City of West Milton. An 80 member Advisory Board was formed who worked in conjunction with the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission (MVRPC) on a watershed action plan. The SWP is overseen by an 16 member Joint Board made up of local landowners and government agency folks. Currently, the SWP has a watershed coordinator who oversees the daily activities of the Project. The majority of the funding for the SWP comes from an Ohio EPA 319 Nonpoint Source Grant. However, the salary/benefits of the coordinator are funded through an ODNR Watershed Coordinator Grant. We rely heavily on the technical assistance from the Natural Resource Conservation Service and SWCDs. The Ohio State University Extension is extremely influential with educational programs. As well as, the nonprofit group, Agriculture for a Clean Environment, Inc. (group of local farmers).

[Return to list of all Group Profiles](#)

<http://ohiowatersheds.osu.edu>



## Watershed Group Profiles

<a href="#">Home</a>	*	<a href="#">Community-Based Watershed Mgt.</a>	*	<a href="#">Ohio Watershed Academy</a>	*	Watershed Group Profiles	*	<a href="#">Resources</a>
----------------------	---	--	---	--	---	--------------------------	---	---------------------------

### Watershed Group Profiles

#### **Little Miami River Partnership (Little Miami River)**

**Contact Name:** LuAnn Winkle

**Job Title:** Watershed Coordinator

**Affiliation:** Little Miami River Partnership

**Address:**

777 Columbus Ave. #5B  
Lebanon, OH 45036

**County:** Warren, Greene, Clinton, Clermont, Clark, Brown, Hamilton, Butler, Fayette, Madison, Montgomery

**Phone:** (513) 695-1187

**Fax:** (513) 695-2943

**Email:** [lwinkel@littlemiamiriver.org](mailto:lwinkel@littlemiamiriver.org)

**Website:** [www.littlemiamiriver.org](http://www.littlemiamiriver.org)

#### **Profile:**

The Little Miami River Partnership is a non-profit organization that works to coordinate and support efforts to maintain and improve the entire Little Miami River watershed through partnerships, planning, education, and commitment.

Formed in 1996, the Partnership has grown from a few concerned citizens to a diverse membership of community members, government officials, agency representatives, public utilities, and environmental and recreational organizations.

Planning is accomplished through a nine-member elected Board of Directors. In 2000, the Partnership hired a full-time Watershed Coordinator to work throughout the watershed and create a Watershed Restoration Plan.

The following are some of the group's major accomplishments:

- Facilitated the Upper Little Miami River Watershed (TMDL) Stakeholder Work Group that is developing a watershed restoration plan for the Upper Little Miami and Caesar Creek sub-watersheds.
- Re-activated the Technical Committee that is working on watershed-wide data identification, collection, storage, and availability for water quality and land use data.
- Created a draft Strategic Planning document that the Partnership will use as a guide to reach goals and objectives over the next several years.
- Coordinated our efforts with those of other watershed management efforts including the Upper Little Miami 319 grant project and the East Fork Watershed project.

[Return to list of all Group Profiles](#)

<http://ohiowatersheds.osu.edu>



## Watershed Group Profiles

[Home](#) \* [Community-Based Watershed Mgt.](#) \* [Ohio Watershed Academy](#) \* [Watershed Group Profiles](#) \* [Resources](#)

### Watershed Group Profiles

#### Miami Conservancy

(Great Miami River Watershed)

**Contact Name:** Sarah Hippensteel

**Job Title:** Watershed Coordinator

**Address:**

40 N. Main Street, Suite 760  
Dayton, OH 45423

**County:** Shelby, Miami, Preble, Clark, Greene, Montgomery, Warren, Butler and Hamilton

**Phone:** (937) 223-1271

**Fax:** (937) 223-4730

**Email:** [shippensteel@miamiconservancy.org](mailto:shippensteel@miamiconservancy.org)

**Website:** [www.miamiconservancy.org](http://www.miamiconservancy.org)

#### Profile:

Miami Conservancy is a watershed-based organization that was established in 1915 to provide flood protection for the Miami Valley after the Great Flood of 1913. In addition to flood protection, Miami Conservancy has also played an active role preserving greenspace, building a network of recreation trails and parks along the river corridors, and monitoring the quality and quantity of groundwater and surface water resources throughout its 87-year history.

Miami Conservancy, because of its unique mission and purpose (authority granted by the Conservancy Act in Ohio's Revised Code), is frequently called upon to help solve water management issues in the region. The boundaries of Miami Conservancy's jurisdiction cross numerous political entities within the Great Miami River watershed.

Miami Conservancy's challenge in the 21st century is to maintain and continue upgrading the region's flood protection system, while working to protect and preserve the Great Miami River watershed and the region's valuable water resources. Miami Conservancy launched its Watershed

Initiative in 2002 and hired two watershed coordinators to lead the charge.

Miami Conservancy's watershed coordinators are working collaboratively with other local watershed coordinators and conservation-minded organizations with the goal of combining forces to have the most positive impact on water quality in the Great Miami River watershed. This partnership group has been calling themselves the Great Miami River Watershed Alliance.

The Watershed Alliance meets quarterly to discuss items of mutual concern, share ideas, review projects and effectively leverage resources. Members of the Alliance include watershed coordinators, soil and water conservation professionals, OSU Extension personnel, environmental planners, as well as representatives from local governments, state agencies and universities.

To learn more about the Great Miami River Watershed Alliance or Miami Conservancy, please visit our website at [www.miamiconservancy.org](http://www.miamiconservancy.org).

For outreach and education information, contact watershed coordinator Angela Manuszak at [amanuszak@miamiconservancy.org](mailto:amanuszak@miamiconservancy.org).

[Return to list of all Group Profiles](#)

<http://ohiowatersheds.osu.edu>



## Watershed Group Profiles

[Home](#) \* [Community-Based Watershed Mgt.](#) \* [Ohio Watershed Academy](#) \* [Watershed Group Profiles](#) \* [Resources](#)

### Watershed Group Profiles

#### East Branch Sugar Creek Watershed (Sugar Creek)

**Contact Name:** Alice McKenney

**Job Title:** Manure Nutrient Management/Watershed Specialist

**Affiliation:** Tuscarawas Soil and Water Conservation District

**Address:**

277-B Canal Street  
New Philadelphia, OH 44663

**County:** Tuscarawas

**Phone:** (330) 339-5584

**Fax:** (330) 339-1559

**Email:** [alice-mckenney@oh.nacdnet.org](mailto:alice-mckenney@oh.nacdnet.org)

#### Profile:

In the early 1990s, local stakeholders first spoke aloud about the need for long term solutions for livestock operators in the East Branch Sugar Creek Watershed. In 1994 the Tuscarawas Soil and Water Conservation District applied for and received Ohio EPA "319" funding for the East Branch Sugar Creek Dairy Waste Separation and Treatment Demonstration Project, which ran from 1995-98.

In summer 1998, Ohio EPA began a water quality study of the Sugar Creek Watershed, including the East Branch. At the same time, with a grant from ODNR Division of Soil and Water, a summer intern completed a livestock inventory of the East Branch Watershed. At the end of the summer, a group of East Branch Watershed landowners were invited to an initial "watershed meeting". There we shared the results of the livestock inventory, the purpose of Ohio EPA's study, and proposed the preparation of a watershed action plan. The group has been meeting quarterly since then, with 10 to 20 stakeholders attending each meeting. Smaller work groups meet more often.

The Tuscarawas SWCD Board of Supervisors has been supportive of the

watershed planning efforts, providing financial support, office space and other in-kind contributions. Ohio EPA awarded the District a "319" Watershed Planning Grant, which has enabled a full time staff person to continue working with landowners/users in the East Branch Watershed.

The majority of the land in our watershed is in family farms, which have been in the same families for three or four generations. They are concerned about communicating a better understanding of the economics of agriculture, especially the dairy business, to the public and to regulatory agencies. They are concerned about their ability to meet water quality goals and potential permitting requirements, and maintain the family farm as a financially viable way of life.

Both agency staff members and local stakeholders have extensive background and training in manure management, including manure collection, storage, treatment (including separation), and agronomic use. They are also knowledgeable about soil capabilities and drainage systems. We have Certified Crop Advisors in our group, and people highly experienced in dairy management. Staff members have lab and research experience with collection and processing of manure, soil and water samples.

The majority of the land in our watershed is in family farms, which have been in the same families for three or four generations. They are concerned about communicating a better understanding of the economics of agriculture, especially the dairy business, to the public and to regulatory agencies. They are concerned about their ability to meet water quality goals and potential permitting requirements, and maintain the family farm as a financially viable way of life.

[Return to list of all Group Profiles](#)

<http://ohiowatersheds.osu.edu>





# Watershed Group Profiles

[Home](#) \* [Community-Based Watershed Mgt.](#) \* [Ohio Watershed Academy](#) \* [Watershed Group Profiles](#) \* [Resources](#)

## Watershed Group Profiles

### **Penn Ohio Watershed Association (Pymatuning/Shenango)**

**Contact Name:** Amy Reeher

**Address:**

140 N. High Street  
Cortland, OH 44410

**County:** Trumbull

**Email:** [amy-reeher@oh.nacdnet.org](mailto:amy-reeher@oh.nacdnet.org)

#### **Profile:**

Major Accomplishments:

Interstate Pymatuning/Shenango Project & the Interstate Pymatuning/Shenango Plan

The Interstate Pymatuning/Shenango Project was designed to help eliminate nonpoint source pollution by two means: cost-sharing and education. The Interstate Pymatuning/Shenango Watershed Plan is a ten-year action plan which addresses the conservation issues within the Pymatuning/Shenango Watershed. The plan assesses the resources, prioritizes problems, and recommends actions for implementation. The plan is scheduled for completion in October 2001.

Primary Concerns:

Some of the concerns in the Pymatuning/Shenango Watershed include land use planning, education of BMPs, outreach, nutrient loading, runoff. All nonpoint source pollution is a concern.

Areas of specialization:

Some areas that members of the Penn Ohio Watershed Association excel in are as follows: public relations, grant writing, educational outreach & educational programming, water quality monitoring (including citizens volunteer monitoring programs), field days, and BMPs (design, implementation, education).

**Formation of the Penn Ohio Watershed Association:**

The Penn Ohio Watershed Association is a grass roots organization working to protect natural resources throughout the Pymatuning/Shenango Watershed. Comprised of local agencies and concerned citizens, the association was created in 1994 to address concerns regarding the health of the watershed. The two agencies that came together to create the association are the Trumbull Soil and Water Conservation District (Ohio) and the Mercer Conservation District (Pennsylvania).

The lead agency of the association is Trumbull SWCD. Active partners and cooperating agencies in the association range from the Ohio EPA and the Pennsylvania DEP to the Greenville Water Authority. The Penn Ohio Watershed Association also works with other watershed groups in the Pymatuning/Shenango.

[Return to list of all Group Profiles](#)

<http://ohiowatersheds.osu.edu>



## Watershed Group Profiles

[Home](#) \* [Community-Based Watershed Mgt.](#) \* [Ohio Watershed Academy](#) \* [Watershed Group Profiles](#) \* [Resources](#)

### Watershed Group Profiles

#### **Wolf Creek Awareness and Resource Evaluation (WeCARE) Project (Wolf Creek Watershed)**

**Contact Name:** Kathy Davis

**Job Title:** Watershed Coordinator

**Affiliation:** Morgan and Washington SWCD

**Address:**

Wolf Creek Watershed Project  
Morgan SWCD  
55 S. Kennebec Ave.  
McConnelsville, OH 43756

**County:** Morgan, Washington

**Phone:** (740) 962-4234

**Fax:** (740) 962-5651

**Email:** [kathy-davis@oh.nacdnet.org](mailto:kathy-davis@oh.nacdnet.org)

**Website:** [www.WolfCreek.oh.nacdnet.org/](http://www.WolfCreek.oh.nacdnet.org/)

#### **Profile:**

The Morgan and Washington County are jointly conducting the Wolf Creek Awareness and Resource Evaluation (WeCARE) Project. It is a water quality project in progress, designed to create a workable management plan for the watershed through water testing and input from stakeholders concerning the quality of the surface water within the Wolf Creek Watershed.

The 234 square mile (149,000 acre) watershed is located in the Allegheny Plateau Region of Southeastern Ohio. Wolf Creek begins in Morgan County (68,078 acres) and ends in neighboring Washington County (81,622 acres) where it discharges into the Muskingum River. Between both counties Wolf Creek and its 37 named tributaries include over 198 stream miles. Major tributaries include: South Branch Wolf Creek, West Branch Wolf Creek, Southwest Fork, Coal Run, Little Wolf Creek, South Fork, Aldridge Run and Goshen Run.

Wolf Creek and its tributaries play a vital role in our livelihoods and every day life. Recreational uses include canoeing, fishing, swimming, hunting and sightseeing. ODNR's heavily used 3,638 acre Wolf Creek Wildlife Area is situated in the middle of the Morgan County portion of the watershed. Camp Hervida, a large private recreational facility, is located in the Washington County portion of the watershed. This camp hosts over 3500 visitors a year providing programs and adult/youth education activities.

The waterways within the watershed provide drainage for the highest number of active farming and livestock operations of any watershed located in either county. In addition to the farming industry, the timber industry and the oil and gas industry also benefit from the abundant natural resources. Along with this, the watershed is home to villages, subdivisions, businesses, fair grounds and vacation homes.

The SWCDs, along with volunteers, are gathering information from the watershed, to prepare a water quality inventory and management plan for the watershed. This plan will assist the SWCDs in developing priorities and to seek funds to assist residents and landowners in making improvements that will lead to improvement of the quality of water within the watershed.

[Return to list of all Group Profiles](#)

<http://ohiowatersheds.osu.edu>



U.S. FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE

Mountain-Prairie Region • Partners for Fish & Wildlife

COLORADO • KANSAS • MONTANA • NEBRASKA  
NORTH DAKOTA • SOUTH DAKOTA • UTAH • WYOMING



[FEATURE STORIES](#) ►

[OVERVIEW](#) ►

[ACCOMPLISHMENTS](#) ►

[PARTNERS](#) ►

[CULTURAL  
RESOURCES](#) ►

[TECHNIQUES](#) ►



SITE MAP

WHO TO CONTACT

## FEATURE STORY

### **High Plains Partnership Implementation through Partners for Fish & Wildlife**

This partnership provides a framework for implementing a multi-year high plains habitat restoration program through Region 6 Partners for Fish and Wildlife.

### **High Plains Partnership Mission Statement**

The High Plains Partnership is made up of public entities and private individuals who have joined together to conserve the cultural and natural heritage of the High Plains. This program is underway with contributed funds and a limited budget.

### **Draft Goals**

- ✍ Keep the landowner on the land
- ✍ Improve communication with landowners and communities
- ✍ Develop incentives and innovative new ways to deal with conflicts (new, better, refined tools)
- ✍ Maintain or restore grassland characteristics that will support viable populations of native species
- ✍ Build trust and credibility with landowners and other key groups
- ✍ Work hand-in-hand with agency and Non-Government partners
- ✍ Reverse declining species of concern and recover listed species
- ✍ Improve biological information for declining species to better implement restoration
- ✍ Reduce litigation under the Endangered Species Act

### **Region 6 Cumulative Habitat/Restoration Objectives for Fiscal Year 2001 through Fiscal Year 2005**

- ≈ 200,000 acres of short-grass or mixed-grass prairie
- ≈ 200 miles of instream or shoreline habitat
- ≈ 10,000 wetland acres

### **Geographic Limits**

The High Plains in Region 6 are defined by the Great Plains Dry Steppe Province and the Great Plains Steppe Province. These are Bailey's Ecoregions 331 and 332. The eastern High Plains boundary is the Prairie Parkland Province. The western boundary is



approximately the 5,500-foot elevation. The northern boundary extends into Canada. The southern boundary includes parts of Region 2. This is a more comprehensive definition of the High Plains than described by Omernik. For example, the Nebraska Sandhills are within Bailey's high plains but not in Omernik's.

### **Species Targeted for Habitat Restoration**

Target species are listed in [Appendix 1](#). Range maps of representative species are shown in [Appendix 2](#). Additional species may be identified by Region 6 and added to the list at any time. Species priorities will be determined by landowner acceptance of projects as well as Service direction.



### **Partners for Fish & Wildlife Role in the High Plains Partnership Implementation**

By Service policy, Partners for Fish and Wildlife is the Service's primary mechanism to deliver on-the-ground habitat projects on private lands to benefit Federal trust species. In Region 6, the private land habitat component of the High Plains Partnership will be delivered to landowners through Partners for Fish and Wildlife. Habitat projects will be selected by the Regional and State Private Lands Coordinators acting as a review committee. Any and all Partners resources and methods may be used to reach the habitat objectives, including interagency agreements, funds leveraging, USDA programs, and direct restoration through Wildlife Extension Agreements. An easement component will be considered, in

collaboration with Realty. An Ecological Services regulatory component can be implemented as an allied strategy.



Drained wetland



Restored wetland

### **Region 6 High Plains Partnership Project Selection Criteria**

- ⌘ Habitat for a variety of declining species is in need of restoration and protection.
- ⌘ Some habitat restoration projects are completed or underway.
- ⌘ Project is too big to be handled with existing personnel and funding.
- ⌘ Project has a high probability of producing substantial, observable, and measurable results.
- ⌘ Project has broad appeal and can be easily marketed to those who will supply funding.
- ⌘ A trusted resource leader is available and will be provided with back-up help.
- ⌘ Fish and Wildlife Service disciplines are supportive.
- ⌘ State and local governments are supportive.



- ⌘ Strong grass roots support is evident.
  - ⌘ A broad range of agency, local government, organizational, and citizen partners will be available for a support group.
  - ⌘ The relative strength of supporters and opponents has been evaluated.
  - ⌘ Existing baseline data are available or strategies are developed to obtain necessary data.
- 

### **Proposed Projects**

Projects to be funded will be identified in annual addenda to this document.

Example projects are described below.

#### **1. Enhancement of Lesser Prairie Chicken Habitat**

Enhancement of lesser prairie chicken habitat -- on private ranches and the Comanche National Grasslands in Baca County, Colorado. This project will enhance lesser prairie chicken habitat on at least 23,000 acres of land under both private and public ownership and will retain an economic ranching operation. The project is expected to grow beyond the initial response to management; the U.S. Forest Service will monitor vegetation response; and the Colorado State University Extension Service will monitor cattle response. Partners for Fish and Wildlife will conduct private land activities such as cross-fencing, water developments, and rangeland seeding. Estimated Partners for Fish and Wildlife funding contribution will be \$100,000 per year which will be matched with \$400,000 contributed funds.

#### ***Project objectives:***

- ⌘ Jointly manage the private, Comanche National Grasslands, and State Leased Land under a comprehensive management plan.
- ⌘ Focus on the tools of livestock grazing, animal impact, and rest for maintaining ecological functions for the management area.
- ⌘ Implement additional range management practices



such as fencing, water developments, and rangeland seeding which will improve short-grass prairie for lesser prairie chickens and will facilitate improved grazing practices.

- ✍ Incorporate and utilize Conservation Reserve Program land into the overall grazing management plan. This will be accomplished by FSA designation of CRP lands as research and demonstration projects.
- ✍ Increase lek density to indicate an upward trend for the lesser prairie chicken and other grassland birds.
- ✍ Provide adequate residual cover to increase nesting habitat for the prairie chicken and other grassland birds.
- ✍ Provide adequate brood rearing habitat to facilitate increased prairie chicken and other grassland bird populations.
- ✍ Increase overall plant and animal diversity to provide a more stable ecological condition.

Background: [Conservation Partnership to benefit lesser prairie-chicken](#)

## 2. The Upper Bad River Project, South Dakota

The Upper Bad River Project, South Dakota -- Working with family ranches to conserve trust species and ensure a sustainable future based on grassland conservation.

**Biological Need** -- Grassland loss throughout the mixed grass prairie of western South Dakota is occurring at an alarming rate. New crop varieties and low livestock prices are contributing to a continuing trend where ranchers plow their remaining grazing lands and plant row or cereal crops in hopes of enhancing farm income. It is estimated that a minimum of 394,000 acres of grazing land was converted to tillage agriculture between 1985 and 1995 in western South Dakota. Grassland conversion has obvious effects on a wide variety of grassland obligate trust species and also directly contributes to damage of associated downstream riparian and riverine habitats.

**Primary Trust Species Benefitting** -- Grassland dependent songbirds, American bison, sicklefin chub,

greater prairie chicken, black-tailed prairie dog, and sturgeon chub.

***Partnership Philosophy*** -- The South Dakota Partners for Fish and Wildlife program believes that the best technique to maintain grassland is to work with ranch families to conserve and enhance large tracts of remaining grazing land. As such, the South Dakota Partners program has been an active partner in the Upper Bad River Project in western South Dakota. This region contains some of the largest tracts of intact mixed grass prairie remaining in South Dakota with over 60 percent of the project area still comprised of grassland. The project was initiated and is administered by five local Conservation Districts in hopes to more effectively implement conservation measures in the watershed and improve water quality throughout the Bad River Basin. The Districts have successfully worked with a variety of funding partners to implement over 15 conservation practices throughout the watershed, and once again demonstrate that locally led conservation initiatives are the most effective.

***Partners for Fish and Wildlife's Role and Primary Objective*** -- The primary role of the South Dakota Partners program in this project has been to work with ranchers to develop and implement fencing and livestock water projects that will encourage ranchers to enhance existing grasslands for sustainable grazing and not convert these lands to tillage agriculture.

***Current Needs*** -- Rancher interest in the fencing and water components of the project continues to grow and currently exceeds partner funding levels. Additional funds from the High Plains Partnership would help meet this growing need and encourage ranchers to maintain their grasslands for future generations. Estimated Partners for Fish and Wildlife funding contribution will be \$75,000 per year which will be matched with \$200,000 in contributed funds.

 [back to top](#)



## Appendix 3: Recommended Reading

## Appendix 3: Recommended Reading

The Land Trust Alliance's Standards and Practices Guidebook: Provides land trusts with step-by-step information and recommendations to ensure that both land trusts and their land transactions are fundamentally sound.

Land Conservation Through Public/Private Partnerships; Eve Endicott, editor. Washington, D.C.: Island Press, 1993, 365 pages. Endicott has compiled a series of contributions that outline the current state of affairs in conservation involving the private and public sectors working cooperatively to achieve conservation goals.

Future Search: An Action Guide to Finding Common Ground in Organizations and Communities; Marvin Weisbord and Sandra Janoff. The book offers techniques for enabling people with diverse viewpoints to effectively plan their future.

Facilitator's Guide to Participatory Decision-making; Sam Kaner et al. Training manual and sourcebook for facilitators and group leaders seeking to encourage full participation, promote mutual understanding, and help groups build inclusive and sustainable agreements.

Institute for Participatory Management and Planning:  
<http://www.ipmp-bleiker.com>